FBIS DAILY REPORT

Soviet Union

Vol III No 024 4 February 1980

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

West's Demagoguery Makes Medium-Range Missile Talks Impossible AA 1
[Mirskiy in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Jan]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Bovin, Shishlin, Levin]
European Response to U.S. CC 1
Vienna Talks CC 2
U.S. Search for Bases CC 3
Rhodesian Situation CC 6
Permanence of Detente CC 6
Further Commentary on Islamabad Conference CC 7
Baykov Article CC 7
[PRAVDA 2 Feb]
Resolution on Iran CC 8
[Tyssovskiy]
Imperialist Intrigues CC 9
[Zubov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Jan]
Smirnov: 1980 Olympics 'Unthinkable' Without U.S. Athletes CC 11
[Paris AFP]
Killanin Statement CC 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Threat Not Imaginery USSR Plans but 'Quite Real U.S. Steps' A 1
[Petrov in PRAVDA 2 Feb]
5-Year Military Plan Gives 'Quick Reaction Complex' Impetus A 2
[Sturua in IZVESTIYA 25 Jan]
Quick Reaction Corps Designed for Worldwide Intervention A 5
[Zykov in IZVESTIYA 23 Jan]
Carter Will Harm Only Own Country by Olympic Boycott A 6
[Ozerov in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Jan]
U.S. Seeks To Use Pakistan Against Afghan Revolution A 9
[Svetlov in PRAVDA 31 Jan]
Zorin on Cronkite, Afghanistan, 'Anti-Soviet Hysteria' A 10
'Dangerous Incidents' Regarding Soviet Planes in U.S. Denounced A 12
Court To Consider Sabotage A 12
Aeroflot Delay A 12
Rightist Course of Unions A 12
[Gayevskiy]
Observer Discusses Carter Draft Registration Proposal A 13
[Reshetnikov]
TASS Correspondent Denounces 'Subversive' Voice of America A 14
[Gan]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Bandura Scores Japanese 'Pacific Community' Efforts [IZVESTIYA 24 Jan] C 1

SOUTH ASIA

Kabul NEW TIMES Denounces International Imperialism D 1
Afghanistan 'Ready' for Friendship With Iran, Pakistan [Demchenko, Mironov in PRAVDA 30 Jan] D 1
Correspondents Attest to Afghan Government Support for Islam [Seyful-Mulyukov, Bazilevich] D 3
Dobrov Explains Soviet Action in Afghanistan as 'Repelling Aggression' D 3
Afghan Refugees Described as 'Most Bitter Enemies' of Country D 6
Afghan Olympic Committee Sends Protest Letter to Carter D 7
1980 Trade Protocol Signed in Moscow Between USSR, Afghanistan D 7
Reportage on Brzezinski, Christopher Visit to Pakistan D 8
Brzezinski, Christopher Arrival D 8
Start of Negotiations D 8
Arms Promises to Haq D 9
Kosygin, Gandhi Exchange Telegrams Noting Cooperation D 9
Kosygin Message D 9
Gandhi Message D 10
Indian President Issues New Government's Program [Shirokov in PRAVDA 29 Jan] D 10
Bulantsev Comments on 'Failure' of Clifford's Mission to India D 11

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Reportage on Heng Samrin's Visit to USSR E 1
Arrival in Tbilisi E 1
Shevardnadze Dinner E 1
Brezhnev Meets at Airport E 1
Phoumi Vongvichit Interviewed on Afghanistan, PRC E 2
Brezhnev, Kosygin Send Greeting to Vietnamese Leaders [PRAVDA 30 Jan] E 3
Masherov-Led Delegation Visits Hanoi Committee E 4
Masherov Addresses USSR-SRV Friendship Meeting E 4
SRV's Nguyen Co Thach Interviewed on USSR Relations E 5

EASTERN EUROPE

Further Reportage on Gromyko Visit to Romania F 1
Continuation of Talks F 1
End of Talks, Departure F 1
Return to Moscow F 1
Romanian Coverage [cross-reference] F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

Schmidt Stresses FRG Will Honor All Agreements with USSR G 1
Soviet Offices Bombed in Paris, Brussels G 1
Nordic States Seek To Preserve Peace, Avoid U.S. Schemes [Goloshubov in IZVESTIYA 24 Jan] G 2
Cooperation with West Costly for Turkey [Suyetina] G 4

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Brezhnev Congratulates Bani Sadr on Election H 1
Students' Statement, Gotbzadeh Remarks Reported H 1
Iranian Decision To Raise Oil Prices Confirmed H 2
Mo'Infar: Iranian Oil Pipeline Sabotaged H 2
Ustinov Welcomes Gromyko Home From Syria H 2
[PRAVDA 30 Jan]
Moscow RPP Scores ATH-THAWRAH Criticism of USSR H 2
[Al-Malih]
Rachkov Denies Plans to Seize Middle East Oilfields H 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Sakharov Abused State's Patience 'Too Long'; Slander 'Punishable' R 1
[Borisov in LITERATURNYA GAZETA 30 Jan]
PRAVDA Report on Dolgikh 28 January Lipetsk Election Speech R 4
[29 Jan]
Paper Reviews Book on Nationalities Question in Uzbekistan R 8
[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 15 Jan]
Kiev Authorities Announce Death of Petr Pogrebnyak R 9
Funeral Ceremonies R 10
Kosygin, Other Leaders Sign Retired Minister's Obituary R 10
[IZVESTIYA 23 Jan]

WEST'S DEMAGOGUERY MAKES MEDIUM-RANGE MISSILE TALKS IMPOSSIBLE

LD011043 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Jan 80 p 3 LD

[Candidate of Historical Sciences Z. Mirskiy article: "Euromissiles and NATO Demagoguery"]

[Text] Soon after the NATO Council session decided last December to deploy new American nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European countries, TIME, the U.S.-published weekly, carried a long article. This article was an out-and-out panegyric of the NATO decision, which TIME magazine even compared to the allies' victory over Napoleon at the battle of Waterloo.

If there is a "victory," there has to be a victor. TIME does not conceal its satisfaction at the fact that the United States was the "victor" at the Brussels session and that it is the militarist circles of the power across the ocean that primarily benefit by the decision to deploy the "Euromissiles." But what about West Europe? Can that region's states also regard the NATO decision as a "victory"? France's LE MONDE gave the following answer to that question: "The story of the Pershing missiles is really an excellent illustration of the fact that today our continent's peoples are no longer their own masters.... We can see perfectly well just what constitutes the U.S. interest in this business of the Pershing missiles. They are a means of controlling Europe...."

So the NATO decision was in no way a "victory" for West Europe. It was essentially a trap into which the Pentagon lured its West European partners. The role of bait was played by the mendacious assertion that as soon as Washington's allies agreed to deploy the Euromissiles NATO would immediately start talks with the Warsaw Pact on mutually reducing medium-range nuclear missile weapons.

However, the offer of these talks which is enshrined in the Brussels session communique and which Western propaganda is today presenting as evidence of NATO's "love of peace" and "good will" is in reality merely a propaganda "knight's move." It is designed to fool the West's peace-loving public and is an attempt to mislead it about the true state of affairs. Switzerland's journal DE GENEVE gave an extremely accurate indication of the motives behind this maneuver when it wrote: "As though to salve its guilty conscience after the nuclear Euromissiles decision, NATO eventually submitted a number of proposals with the aim of convincing both the Western public and the Warsaw Pact leaders of its sincerity so far as disarmament is concerned."

As far as the peoples of the Warsaw Pact countries are concerned, it is absolutely wasted effort to try to convince them of NATO's "sincerity." The scale on which, and shamelessness with which the Atlanticists use lies, slander and demagoguery are too well known. In particular, their prating about talks is sheer demagoguery. What kind of talks with NATO can there be after the Brussels session? As the Soviet Union has repeatedly warned, the decision taken there destroyed the basis for honest and fair talks about medium-range nuclear missile weapons.

However, the West is pretending it does not know of this principled USSR stand. And some people are even posing as the injured party. In an interview with WELT-ZEITUNG, FRG Foreign Minister Genscher declared with feigned enthusiasm: "No one should refuse to take our outstretched hand." At the beginning of January the whole NATO Council made the sweeping statement that it wants to hold talks, but the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact reject them. [paragraph continues]

Statements of this sort--and all NATO propaganda embroiders them with appropriate "designs"--are aimed at convincing the Western public that NATO is in favor of disarmament and is prepared for talks on this problem, but everything is being held up by the USSR's "intractability." In other words, the Atlanticists are trying to relieve themselves of the blame for the effective wrecking of talks on medium-range missiles and to lay the blame on the Soviet Union.

Some Western Europeans may say: What difference does it make when the talks are held--before the North Atlantic bloc Council session or after? The difference between the immediate talks that the USSR insistently suggested before the NATO session and the "talks" about which NATO waxes oratorically is enormous. The USSR offered talks under the conditions of approximate equality between the NATO and Warsaw Pact military forces on the European Continent. Regarding this equality as an important factor in mutual security, the USSR does not seek military superiority. Throughout the seventies it did not increase the number of nuclear weapon delivery vehicles in its western regions by a single missile or a single aircraft. Moreover, the Soviet Union officially stated that if NATO did not "upgrade the arms" of West Europe with Euromissiles, it was prepared to reduce the number of its medium-range missiles deployed in western regions of the country. At the same time the USSR began unilaterally withdrawing units of its troops from the GDR and proposed a number of other measures which, if implemented, could have broken the deadlock in military detente in Europe, prevented a new spiral in the arms race and strengthened mutual trust and security on the continent.

All these proposals, put forward by L.I. Brezhnev 6 October 1979 at the celebrations in Berlin and concretized a month later in his answers to the PRAVDA correspondent's questions, consituted an integrated and constructive program for maintaining and consolidating European peace in the eighties. West Europe's progressive publ[illegible] greeted this program with satisfaction. But Washington and certain West European political circles greeted it literally with bayonets drawn.

The point is that imperialist circles have long wanted a "position of strength" from which they could speak to the USSR--or, to be more accurate, dictate their will to it. They once tried to acquire this position by adopting the neutron bomb. West Europe held its ground then and did not yield to the American pressure. Now Washington has decided to reach a "position of strength" via the Euromissiles. British Conservative circles and the FRG Government openly played up to the Americans in achieving this aim. Two months before the Brussels session and J. Carter's statement that the decision taken there enables the United States and NATO to negotiate with the Warsaw Pact "on the basis of strength," West German Defense Minister H. Apel said in an interview with Deutschlandfunk radio station: "We...need the NATO decision. Talks will produce nothing at all unless they are backed by the necessary military preparations.... Unless we show the firm political will to maintain our defense capability, talks will be quite meaningless."

In other words, Apel openly admitted that the Pentagon and NATO need the "arms upgrading" decision not in order to hold honest talks on arms reduction--talks that infringe no one's security--but merely in order to acquire a "position of strength." It is only then that the talks make sense, from NATO's viewpoint, only then that they can produce the desired result--insure military superiority for the North Atlantic bloc. But what self-respecting state would allow talks to be held with it from a position of strength! Especially a great socialist power--the Soviet Union!

"We are in favor of talks, but honest, equitable talks observing the principle of identical security," L.I. Brezhnev pointed out in his answers to the PRAVDA correspondent on 13 January. "Those are the kind of talks we recently proposed starting on the issue of medium-range nuclear weapons. No one can expect the Soviet Union to accept NATO's conditions, which are designed to hold the talks from a position of strength."

NATO's demagoguery about talks and the Atlanticists' desire to lay the blame at another's door mislead many people in the West. Nevertheless, all that cannot conceal the fact that West Europe has effectively fallen into the American trap as a result of the decision taken in Brussels: It has got "arms upgrading" but it has lost talks on arms reduction. West Germany's WESTFAELISCHE RUNDSCHAU spoke out perfectly clearly on this score. "What would have happened," the newspaper wrote, "if the West had accepted the offer of talks made by L.I. Brezhnev and had not wasted it with the decision to upgrade armaments? The supporters of the NATO decision should have thought again. For only half is left of the vaunted 'NATO dual decision'--armaments. The talks have been deferred." And, the newspaper continues, deferred "not only because Moscow rejected them, but also because the present sentiments in Washington do not allow them to be held."

There is much eloquent evidence of the "present sentiments in Washington." President Carter's recent speeches are permeated from beginning to end by the cold war spirit. Take his decision to postpone indefinitely ratification of the SALT II treaty, the 5-year military program announced by the White House simultaneously with the adoption of the NATO Euromissiles decision and envisaging a constant increase in real (taking inflation into account) military spending of more than 4.5 percent per year. And the military pressure on Iran.... And the unbridled anti-Soviet hysteria over the USSR's military aid to Democratic Afghanistan!.... Those facts, and the list could be continued, are evidence that the leading circles of the United States and certain other NATO countries have adopted a course hostile to the cause of detente, a course toward stepping up the arms race, a course leading to intensified danger of war.

In the light of what has been said it is obvious that Washington and NATO were not casual but perfectly logical and deliberate in rejecting the Soviet proposal that talks on medium-range weapons be started without delay. They not only did not want those talks; they were mortally afraid of them. They were afraid the talks would cut out the ground from beneath the feet of the supporters of the NATO Council's Euromissiles decision, which, Washington calculated, would allow the United States to deal with the Soviet Union in a different, tougher way, with considerably less consideration for its West European allies' opinions and interests.

That is what has happened. In the first 10 days of January people learned of a memorandum in which President Carter effectively announced the U.S. refusal to hold talks on arms limitation at all, including the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe that have been going on in Vienna for more than 6 years now. The President, the New York TIMES wrote, has essentially ordered that the American Arms Control and Disarmament Agency cease its attempts to "beat swords into plowshares."

And after all that NATO propaganda dares to speak of some sort of "rejection" of talks by the Soviet Union and, what is more, to unhesitatingly make demagogic offers to the USSR. Only the repeal of the NATO decisions to produce and deploy new American missiles in West Europe or the real suspension of their implementation--on which an official decision must also be adopted--would make it possible to start effective talks on this issue; that is the Soviet Union's firm and principled position under the prevailing conditions. It is shared and supported by the other fraternal socialist countries.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD031822 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

["International Observers Roundtable" program with Aleksandr Bovin, IZVESTIYA political observer; Nikolay Shishlin, international affairs journalist; Viktor Levin, all-union radio commentator]

[Text] [Levin] Good Morning, esteemed comrades. Our meeting today is taking place in circumstances of increasing attempts by the United States to wreck the process of detente.

European Response to U.S.

This was reflected in President Carter's State of the Union Message, in the report by the U.S. secretary of defense, who is trying to justify the necessity for monstrous military expenditures on a scale of $158.7 billion, in the military and diplomatic activity, with the accent on the military, which Washington's emmissaries are carrying out, and in increasing imperialist pressure on Iran.

However, the more active the U.S. actions, hostile to the cause of detente and to the cause of peace, the more distinct is the lack of acceptance of this policy and the more apparent is the opposition to it. It is true that the international situation, through the fault of imperialist forces, and first and foremost certain circles in the United States, has become more complex. One must see this; it has to be reckoned with. But Washington has not been able to drive mankind into the trenches of the cold war and this is a fact which is even more weighty. It is determined first and foremost by the purposeful, consistent foreign policy of the Soviet Union, a policy aimed at deepening the process of detente, a policy aimed at strengthening peace. This has been reflected, in particular, in the visit to Syria made just recently by the USSR foreign minister, Comrade Gromyko. This was also reflected in the results of the meeting between the leaders of two fraternal socialist countries, Czechoslovakia and the Polish People's Republic, Comrades Husak and Gierek.

The policy of nonacceptance of American pressure and the American course to an undermining of detente is also being reflected in the actions of individual West European states.

[Shishlin] I would put it this way. In the world equation the United States clearly represents a major but not the only quantity. This circumstance without a doubt is observable in the nuances of political attitudes which one is able to see, including the attitudes adopted at present by leading partners of the United States in the capitalist world.

Perhaps only the British Conservatives, led by Thatcher, are solidly ranging themselves behind the American foreign political course. There are reports coming through now that the British Government is beginning to shop for new types of American nuclear missiles, in particular the Trident system, and, in following Washington's policy, is planning in the coming years to substantially increase the military budget of the country. However, perhaps such implicit agreement with the course announced by the White House, will not be repeated in the other European capitals.

[Bovin] Yes. Last month I was in the FRG for 10 days and met politicians and journalists, representatives of various parties, and I got the following impression. First and foremost, they always start off by talking about solidarity with the United States. This theme is undoubtedly one of those in the forefront at present. But having said all the expected words on the subject, they then go on to another theme which at the present moment is heavily stressed. We do not want to reject, they say, all those fruits of detente which have been amassed over the past 10 years.

We want these fruits to be preserved. We want the preservation of contacts, the continuation of talks, etc, etc. In other words, all this theme is very apparent and this is understandable because after all, it is a fact that Europeans, West Europe, that is, more clearly feel the fruits of detente on the one hand and on the other an intensification of the threat of war. Of course in general this worries Europeans perhaps more than it does the Americans. Their experience in this is more weighty, and their geographical situation is also relevant. Because of this, this duality is characteristic, not only, let us say, of political leaders in the FRG, but also perhaps in the main West European states. At present, stress is being laid, I repeat, on the one hand, on solidarity with America, and on the other, on a kind of very accented attention being paid to the necessity of preserving the fruits of detente.

France, perhaps, in this case, appears a little as an outsider as always, being the least inclined to express such solidarity. It as always is purusing its own foreign policy, reflecting, as Paris thinks, the interests of France itself.

[Levin] Even those states which talk about solidarity are not hurrying to carry out practical action and I would like in this respect to return to the FRG. At the moment, Washington, as is known, is demanding from all its NATO partners a further increase in military expenditures. But FRG Defense Minister Apel says that he does not see any need for this, that the FRG has already made its contribution to the common NATO budget and that this is enough.

[Bovin] I would like to add to this that this kind of neurotic reaction by Washington to events which are taking place, in particular the ones in Afghanistan, this change in policy by Washington and its emphasis on military presence in that region is what causes alarm among the Europeans, because the question is in fact being posed: Is detente to be preserved or is there to be a return to the cold war? This is also very much felt in West Europe, this anxiety over these sharp, unconsidered and in general such angry statements which are at the moment being uttered by Carter.

[Shishlin] It is then perhaps symptomatic that in Europe itself discussions are being more or less actively carried on over the meeting, planned for autumn of 1980 in Madrid, of representatives of states which took part in the general European conference.

Vienna Talks

It is apparent also that interest is being preserved in the idea put forward by the socialist countries concerning the holding of a general European conference at a political level on measures of trust and military detente, and undoubtedly on a par with these events is the fact of resumption of the Vienna talks on reductions in armaments and armed forces in central Europe, although one must say quite frankly that the attitudes of the sides at the Vienna talks differ from each other by quite a bit. While the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries taking part in these talks have put forward somewhat extensive and constructive proposals, NATO, in essence, bears the lion's share of responsibility for the fact that these talks have not advanced much further.

[Levin] Yes, the talks have been going on for a very long time now and undoubtedly many of our radio listeners have already forgotten who the direct participants are in these talks, so I will remind them that on the Warsaw Pact states' side are the Soviet Union, the GDR, Poland and Czechoslovakia. On the NATO side are the United States, Canada, Great Britain, the FRG, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. Direct participants are presumed to be those whose troops and whose territory are to be subject to reductions in armed forces and armaments.

This is, however, the goal which was laid at the very beginnings of the Vienna talks; in recent times the matter effectively concerns reductions only in armed forces and armaments of the Soviet Union and the United States in central Europe.

[Shishlin] In the first stage.

[Levin] In the first stage. However, even on this question, although the problem was presented by the Western powers in such a way, nothing is being done by them to find mutually acceptable solutions. Although it is quite obvious that in present conditions, particularly after those extremely dangerous decisions of the December session of the NATO Council, primarily the decision on the production and deployment of new American nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European states, the significance of the Vienna talks is growing immeasurably.

[Bovin] It is of course essential to keep in view the factor that it was generally supposed that ratification of SALT II would have given a sufficiently strong impulse for Vienna, but insofar as this ratification has not taken place, inasmuch as the Americans, generally speaking, have delayed the whole matter. Then of course, although of course there is no formal connection, it does affect the vitality of the entire Vienna talks. This should also be borne in mind, in my opinion.

[Shishlin] Yes, and this is once again illustrated by the fact that the events in world politics are as a rule interconnected. One influences the other and the influence is mutual, of course.

U.S. Search for Bases

At a time when the United States is sending out its officials in the search of new military bases, when the placement of military bases is being extended, Somalia, Oman, Kenya and Pakistan are already figuring here. Kissinger, it seems, is actually proposing the establishment of American bases, equipped with American hardware by the American Air Force, in Pakistan. All this will naturally influence the situation. Mind you, it is typical that when the Americans give the reasons for their new policy, so to speak, they refer above all to the events in Afghanistan. But the reorientation of Carter's foreign policy toward intensifying aspects of the cold war, towards intensifying this military-political pressure, began long before the events in Afghanistan; at the beginning of last year, and it is very typical, an article in the New York TIMES the other day contained the following phrase. Here is what it said: Afghanistan was a heaven-sent stroke of luck, declared a government official. The events in Afghanistan provided the opportunity for action in the sphere of a change of approach, which was already being implemented. This also has to be borne in mind against the background of all the hysterical screaming about Afghanistan which is coming from Washington.

This revision of foreign policy, I should like to stress once again, began quite a long time before these events. It began, in fact, in connection with the phenomena which have occurred above all in Iran. When this strongpoint of the Americans was knocked out there, when it transpired that the situation developing in Iran was influencing the whole of the Middle East--and that is naturally connected with oil--then the Americans started a feverish search for ways, in a situation in which Iran had been lost, in the situation of general instability which was emerging there, to compensate for this loss, to compensate for it somehow. Naturally, since thinking went along traditional imperial lines, the search was on for fresh standpoints, for fresh alliances of military-political kind. Hence, this entire policy.

[Levin] They sought to resurrect old alliances, with Turkey for example, with which they have now reached agreement on the establishment of military bases.

[Shishlin] Moreover, another thing is typical. Let us take Pakistan. This is very typical for Carter and the Americans who went on so much about human rights. What do we see? In Pakistan there is in fact the terrorist, dictatorial Ziaul Haq regime, which maybe differs a little from the shah's regime. Having forgotten all their invocations about human rights, the Americans are ready to pump in hundreds of millions for arms again, are ready to support the regime, are ready for a concentrated military presence there. So one could say that the situation with Iran is effectively being repeated there. It is no coincidence that it is being written that at the end of the day the result could be the same, too--that is, instead of consolidating their positions there, the Americans will again encounter an explosive destabilizing process.

[Bovin] Yes, Anderson, the well-known American political observer, wrote just that in the Washington POST: Pakistan's Ziaul Haq could become another shah. In Pakistan, in Pakistan today, the United States sees an opportunity for finding a fresh foothold in the Middle East. The United States hoped that in carrying out interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan it would manage to consolidate its hold there right on the Soviet Union's southern border. But these plans were wrecked by the actions of the revolutionary nucleus of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and Washington now has to reckon with that. Special attention in connection with this is being devoted to Pakistan. Just look: Literally these very days a whole series of visits by prominent American statesmen is under way to Pakistan. Brzezinski, Presidential assistant for national security affairs, is there at the moment. He is regarded as one of the authors of this tough line in Washington policy.

[Shishlin] Not without reason.

[Bovin] As you say, not without reason! Accompanying him here is Christopher, deputy secretary of state. At the same time, and this coincidence has already been noticed in India, at the same time, the deputy defense secretary is there. What is involved are very active efforts to draw Pakistan into the sphere of American military-political strategy, and of course this fact demands the closest attention. I would note here another fact, that these numerous American visits were preceded by actions by Beijing. Beijing in this case is acting as a very active accessory to the American policy of undermining detente. You will recall the visit by Huang Hua, the minister of foreign affairs. Immediately after this visit of Huang Hua to Pakistan it was announced in Beijing that the next meeting of Chinese and Vietnamese representatives at the talks on the normalization of relations would be deferred for the alleged reason that the head of the Chinese delegation, the deputy minister of foreign affairs, was otherwise occupied. Evidently, he is occupied with the same affairs that Huang Hua was in Pakistan, in other words, inflaming enmity toward Democratic Afghanistan and acting in a manner diametrically opposed to those that pursue the strengthening of peace.

[Shishlin] Going back to the Americans, it seems to me--difficult as it is to predict anything at the moment--it seems to me that their attempt to secure for themselves a sure situation in the region by expanding military contacts with Pakistan will eventually take a completely different turn: On the one hand, owing to the instability of the situation in Pakistan itself, and on the other, owing to India's reaction, because India is currently alarmed by all the fuss over Pakistan. India is alarmed by the fact that the intention is to supply a vast quantity of modern arms here. There is little probability that these arms will be used for defense against Afghanistan, since Afghanistan has no such anti-Pakistani designs, while the fact that they could be turned on India, something which has already happened, is a very real possibility, which is of course disquieting for Delhi.

[Levin] I should like to use the example of China again, since, as is widely known, the Americans have made the decision to sell China so-called auxiliary military equipment, which does not amount to outright weapons, but could be used for military purposes.

[Bovin] It is dual-purpose technology.

[Levin] Yes, the so-called intermediate or grey area. There are various designations. In any case, the Americans made the decision. In the same way, they decided to grant China Most-Favored Nation status. In any case, American gifts are being showered on China. But as for the manner in which they will be digested in China and the manner in which they will be used by China, that is quite another matter. Quite another matter. To think that presentday China will go America's way is perhaps a delusion. If now, even in American estimations, Carter has switched from being a global preacher to being a tough guardian of America's geopolitical interests, and is attempting to expand his police force by including China, then it seems to me that in itself this alliance, this partnership, however dangerous it may be, this partnership is leavened with yeast which can give a result that is utterly unexpected and far removed from the calculations now prevailing in Washington.

[Bovin] There is perhaps another interesting aspect to this subject. The Americans are saying that the Persian Gulf area is very important to them because of oil. This is understandable, though it is not as important to the Americans as it is to West Europe or Japan. One can indeed understand that. But the following rather interesting picture emerges: In order for the region to be stable, in order for stable oil supplies to be insured, it is necessary above all to secure the internal stability of the countries there. It is necessary--and this is not the least important--to insure that the spirit of detente reigns throughout the world, because then there would be no other processes.

While the Americans, in this attempt of theirs to set up bases again, to establish these informal alliances, as they now refer to them, and to secure things with military, with sort of military-political ties, in the long run solve the problem, shall we say, tactically, if they want to, the overall strategic problem, the problem of the stability of that region, can in no way be solved by such means. Here I find it perfectly clear that they will continue to come up against the same old problems over and over again, the ones which they are trying to settle by unsuitable means which cannot be used for solving them.

[Shishlin] It appears to me that this heightened attention which the United States is now manifesting vis-a-vis Pakistan, and Pakistan obviously wants to make a very good thing out of it--evidently you have noticed the fact that when the Americans declared their readiness to make aid available to Pakistan, Ziaul Haq said that they should be talking about $1 billion at the very least, and the haggling is obviously now going on--is fraught with danger not only for India; it is fraught with danger most certainly for Iran also. After all, the bitter confrontation which the United States is now conducting against Iran gets rougher and, I would say, brasher, with every passing day. It turns out that there were maneuvers recently in Massachusetts State, for instance, during which they practiced carrying out a large-scale seaborne landing. With combat helicopter support, the assault group delivered to Cape Cod Peninsula by ship captured a simulated strongpoint. They were backed up by tanks and armored transporters sporting pennants reading: Go for Iran. That's the way American servicemen are being trained. That's what they are being readied for. Judging from the concentration of an enormous naval force around Iran, which is taking place, this factor is totally self-explanatory. Thus, the military aid to Pakistan is certainly one of the elements of this policy of military pressure on Iran also.

[Bovin] The Americans have indeed been trying just recently to maneuver around just a little bit, making use of these very events in Afghanistan. One hears statements from Washington about their being prepared at some later time to give Iran aid and support and anything you like. For the time being, of course, this is nothing but talk and the essence of the matter remains the same as you have talked about. There is an actual confrontation and these sanctions, which the Americans have not yet completely wound out to the fullest extent.

But these do in fact exist, as a threat, as it were, and they talk nearly every day about being ready to apply them at any minute.

Rhodesian Situation

[Levin] This struggle against the national liberation movement, the struggle against the striving of peoples to become masters of their own destiny, is reflected in literally all areas of the globe. Take these events in Rhodesia again. This week the Security Council discussed the problem and the talk was that Britain, or more accurately, the British governor of Rhodesia, Lord Soames, is blatantly violating the agreement worked out in London. This finds expression in their not allowing many Zimbabweans who were compelled at some time to leave the country to return home, the fact that South African troops remain, while the London TIMES--sometimes it has really candid pieces--shed what I think is a very clear light, on 31 January, on the real nature of all these actions of British policy. Referring to authoritative sources, THE TIMES thinks: If the elections were held now in Zimbabwe-Rhodesia then Robert Mugabe's party would get a majority of seats in parliament and he would become the first prime minister of independent Zimbabwe. THE TIMES says straight out that this prospect worries British officials. Worry is, of course, an understatement. In fact, it spurs British officials into active counteraction, which of course places the Rhodesia problem in a very tough spot.

[Bovin] After the pressure which the Security Council will apply, if the British don't improve their behavior there just a little bit I think in general that Muzorewa will lose the election and new political groups will come to power.

[Shislin] Unfortunately, however, some of the participants in the political drama in Rhodesia enjoy certain advantages of position. Included are Britain and the Republic of South Africa, and also these multinational corporations, which see absolutely no need to relinquish their opportunities for plundering Rhodesia, plundering Zimbabwe. This Rhodesian drama has itself been playing for some considerable time and it is no coincidence that it has now at this time stirred African countries to insist on the Security Council being convened, because they see that the denouncement which is being stage-managed is one which runs counter to the interests of the population of that country, the indigenous population of that country.

Permanence of Detente

However, I should like to deal with another topic. Since we started with a few general assessments and general premises it is evidently worth saying that this slough of tension which has now taken shape in international relations has of course dragged in many states and many political forces. In itself the flare-up of this tension and the growth of this tension without a doubt cast a shadow on international relations and impede the development of those positive processes which were characteristic of the 1970's. At the same time, at the same time, I feel that in global policy and in international relations we should take into account the ongoing influence exerted by those groups which are for the continuation of the detente process, for the advance along that road and for the complementing of political detente with military detente. I feel that in this context it would not be irrelevant to stress that all the constructive ideas which were set out last autumn in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's Berlin speech; and those constructive ideas which were voiced by the participants in the Warsaw Pact at the foreign ministers' meeting at Budapest, have by no means been swept off the table of world politics by this explosion of tension. Moreover, these constructive ideas are especially important at the present time and it is altogether logical that it is precisely this side of the matter on which attention was focused in the well-known replies of Leonid Ilich Brezhnev to questions asked by a PRAVDA correspondent.

[Bovin] In general, however, to somehow sum up what we have been saying, in fact the situation is of course alarming, of course. Of course there has been a slowdown in detente, but all the same I feel that that this flare-up in adventurism which we are currently observing, primarily American adventurism, will prove unable to break that trend toward relaxation of tension which characterized the 1970's. It will prove unable to do so for the very reason that all in all there is no other way out. There is no other alternative. You can do your bit of shouting today, you can stage a hysterical fit tomorrow and you can stamp your feet the day after, but all the same, afterwards the Americans are going to have to return to the road of detente, because there is no other road. This, plus the pressure which both the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and all peace-loving forces are going to continue to apply, all this enables one generally to conclude that the present situation is a passing one. It is a temporary one. Everything will come back, as it were, to that road, to where we started. That point, in this instance, is of course the relaxation of tension and the further removal of the threat of world war.

[Levin] On that optimistic note we shall wind up our program. Thank you, respected listeners, for your attention, and all the best.

FURTHER COMMENTARY ON ISLAMABAD CONFERENCE

Baykov Article

LD041203 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 80 p 5 LD

[V. Baykov "Commentator's Column": "Whose Ends Does This Serve?"]

[Text] A session of the Islamic Conference Organization has been held in Pakistan's capital. Its work proceeded against the background of an increasing military activity by the United States and its allies in the area of the Indian Ocean and the Near and Middle East, activity which is aimed at imposing U.S. military-political dominance on the countries situated there, at suppressing the revolutions in Iran and Afghanistan and at driving Arab peoples into the trap of the separate Camp David deal between Washington, Tel Aviv and Cairo.

In the speeches made by some participants in the session, as well as in the session's resolutions, the policy of Washington and its allies was justly criticized. It was pointed out, in particular, that the U.S.-Israeli-Egyptian collusion is an obvious violation of the rights of the Palestinian people, and a threat to the security and independence of Arab and Muslim states. The participants in the session came out against Washington's threats of using force, addressed to Iran, as well as against the economic sanctions, which the U.S. administration declared with regard to that country.

At the same time, the session's work showed that in a number of questions the organizers of the session obviously followed the forces of imperialism and reaction. This became particularly manifest during the discussion at the session of so-called "Afghan question" imposed on it. The session's resolution on the question not only completely distorts the nature of the events in Afghanistan but is also a gross interference in the affairs of that sovereign state. The resolution, in particular, calls on the organization members to "discontinue" all kinds of relations with the Government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA]. A decision was also adopted to suspend Afghanistan's membership in the Islamic Conference Organization. The Soviet Union's assistance rendered to the DRA at the request of its government is represented in the resolution in a distorted light.

The Islamabad session's decisions, which run counter to the interests of peace and of the freedom of the peoples, aroused a legitimate indignation among the progressive, democratic circles of the whole world, including those in Muslim countries themselves. The Islamic Conference Organization session's decisions with regard to Afghanistan, Afghan Foreign Minister Mohammad Dost said, were taken under pressure from U.S. imperialism and from reactionary forces in the region and their accomplices in Asia, including China, which have tried to use the conference to interfere in Afghanistan's internal affairs and to create tension in this part of the world.

Resolution on Iran

LD012026 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

["Under Washington's Pressure"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, February 1, TASS--TASS commentator Yuriy Tyssovskiy writes:

The results of the session of the Islamic Conference Organization held in Islamabad (Pakistan) the other day indicate that the foreign ministers of the Moslem states were pressured by the imperialist powers of the West in the first place by the USA. This fact was brought to light in particular in drawing up the session's resolution on the U.S. pressure on Iran.

The Iranian delegation went to Pakistan in the clear hope that it was precisely at this Moslem forum that the Islamic Republic of Iran would have the broadest support for its position on the conflict with the USA. This stand, as is known, reduces to the fact that the Iranian-U.S. crisis is rooted in the refusal of the White House to extradite the deposed shah to Iran as a criminal responsible for the death of thousands of patriots and the ruler who misappropriated huge sums of state funds. But the resolution did not even mention this Iranian demand. It only spoke in most general terms about the "sincere wish" of the participants in the session that the sides should settle outstanding problems peacefully and about "resolute opposition" to the threat from Washington to use economic sanctions against Iran, and that was all.

Thus, Islamic solidarity proved to be unable to withstand open pressure of Washington, which feared strong criticism on the part of the Moslem countries and strived to reduce the work of the session only to the notorious "Afghan question". Therefore, the U.S. State Department had masterminded in advance in the necessary direction most participants in the session using the Saudi and Pakistani delegations. This has predetermined the evasive attitude of the ministers to Tehran's just demands.

The results of the session in Iran were met with open discontent in Iran. The Islamabad session convened as a result of "instigation of the USA and world Zionism" constitutes great danger to the Iranian revolution, said the appeal by the theological center in Qom. Americans assisted by the reactionary regimes of a number of countries are trying to pit the Moslems of the whole world, including the Moslems of Iran, against the USSR, it stressed. It is pointed out in Tehran that the Islamic reactionary regimes are linked with Washington by the common fear of the wind of change sweeping the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Peninsula, the fear that the "Iranian precedent" may repeat in other countries of the region.

Imperialist Intrigues

LD011417 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Sergey Zubov "International Review": "Behind the Scenes of the U.S. Conspiracy"]

[Text] A conference of foreign ministers of the states belonging to the Islamic Conference Organization opens in Islamabad (Pakistan) tomorrow. In this connection imperialist propaganda and certain politicians in a number of Muslim countries have raised a hue and cry in the last few days about the need for "Muslim solidarity" to "check" the Soviet Union which, "by its actions in Afghanistan," is allegedly trying to "damage the Afghan people's dignity and their religious feelings." As always, this propaganda fuss, directed and encouraged by the Carter administration, makes use of overtly fraudulent distortions and downright political roguery.

For instance, it is asserted that the conference is being convened in connection with the "extraordinary circumstances" which have arisen in Afghanistan, and that Bangladesh is the initiator of the convening of the conference. Yet it is well known that this meeting is the routine annual conference of foreign ministers of the Islamic Conference Organization and was planned in advance for January; it is also known that Bangladesh is no more involved in convening it than the other members of the organization. As for the "extraordinary circumstances" which were allegedly the reason for convening it, apart from what has been said above, it is quite clear that internal political changes in Afghanistan and the Soviet Union's assistance to the neighboring Afghan people, granted at the request of their lawful government, are a matter for Afghanistan and its people.

"Unceasing armed intervention and the far-reaching conspiracy between external reactionary forces created a real threat that Afghanistan would lose its independence," L. I. Brezhnev stated, answering a PRAVDA correspondent's questions, "and be transformed into an imperialist military bridgehead on our country's southern border. In other words, the time had come when we could no longer refuse the request of friendly Afghanistan's Government. Acting in any other way would have meant handing Afghanistan over to be torn apart by imperialism and permitting the aggressive forces to repeat here what they managed to do, for instance, in Chile, where the people's freedom was drowned in blood. Acting in any other way would have meant looking on passively while a seat of serious danger to the Soviet state's security arose on our southern border."

As for the Islamic Conference Organization itself, it was created in 1969 on Saudi Arabia's initiative after the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Israeli-occupied East Jerusalem was set on fire. The members of the organization, which now has 42 members including the PLO, set themselves the task of propagandizing the ideas of Islam, strengthening solidarity among members and elaborating a united position on the main international problems and on economic cooperation. The General Secretariat of the Islamic Conference is located in Jidda in Saudi Arabia, and naturally that country, with its recently increased political prestige and economic potential, plays an important role in elaborating and implementing the organization's decisions.

Imperialism's apologists and their yesmen, in their present propaganda campaign against the Soviet Union, are trying to prove the existence of "age-old contradictions" between Islam and "atheistic communism" which, they say, must inevitably prevent the formulation of a united stance on political questions of interest to both sides. Here they deliberately keep quiet about the fact that the differences which exist relate to world outlook and have never excluded the desire to understand the other side's motives and the possibility of cooperation for the sake of humanitarian goals.

Many examples could be cited of how Marxists have come out resolutely in support of the deprived masses of Muslim believers. In this connection, suffice it to recall the well-known message from the young Soviet Republic "to all Muslim working people in Russia and the east." One could also refer specifically to such generally known cases in recent times as the USSR's effective assistance to the Arab people's liberation struggle against imperialism and against Israel, which occupies the Muslim holy places in East Jerusalem, or the Soviet Union's support for the Iranian revolution, which is developing under Islamic slogans. The Soviet Union and the socialist community countries, as well as Marxist-Leninists in Asian and African states, inevitably support the actions of the population in Muslim countries against the unequal economic relations foisted on them by imperialist powers, against the plundering of their national wealth, and also against the "Westernization" and "Americanization" of society, which lead to the erosion of the traditional foundations of everyday life and Muslim morality.

It is American imperialism which is above all the mortal enemy of the Muslim states' independence. The irreconcilable contradictions between Islam and its followers on the one hand and American imperialism and its accomplices on the other are manifested in all spheres of political, economic and ideological life. Everyone knows that the United States supports Israel, which has since 1967 been occupying East Jerusalem, where there are two mosques--Al-Aqsa and the Dome of the Rock--which are regarded as the third-most-holy places of Islam, after the Saudi cities of Mecca and Medina. The Carter administration has elaborated a Near East settlement plan according to which East Jerusalem remains under Israeli occupation and the Arab people of Palestine are deprived of their right to create their own state. The United States is trying with all its might to prevent the extradition of the fugitive shah, who has been declared an enemy of the Iranian people, and supports Egyptian President A. as-Sadat, whose capitulatory anti-Arab deal with Israel led to his expulsion from the Islamic Conference Organization during the annual session of foreign ministers in the Moroccan city of Fez in May 1979. It is the United States, not the Soviet Union, which has concentrated in the Indian Ocean the biggest grouping of naval forces since World War II, directed against Muslim Iran and other oil countries in the Muslim Persian Gulf. By these actions the United States is threatening by no means only Iran but all the other Muslim countries too.

There are plenty of sober-minded politicians among the Muslim leaders who understand the hidden meaning of the propaganda campaign unleashed by the United States and its accomplices. This is indicated by the decisions of the conference of foreign ministers of countries belonging to the national Steadfastness and Confrontation Front, comprising Syria, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Algeria, Libya and the PLO, which finished work in Damascus on 17 January. The conference came to the conclusion that the artificial ballyhoo created by the United States, Israel and Egypt around events in Iran and Afghanistan pursues the goal of diverting the Arab and Muslim peoples from the course of struggle against the Zionist occupation, undermining Arab and Muslim solidarity and sowing enmity between the Arab nation and its friends, first and foremost the Soviet Union. Such conclusions by the progressive Arab states and the Palestinians are quite natural.

To the drumbeat about "Soviet interference" in Afghanistan's affairs, the United States, Israel and Egypt are trying to foist on the region their plan for a Near East settlement which leaves the Arab people of Palestine high and dry, are strengthening the aggressive Cairo-Tel Aviv axis and are creating American military bases in Egypt and Oman, which together with the U.S. military armanda based in the Indian Ocean constitute a mortal threat to all the Muslim peoples. It must be supposed that this threat will be discussed at conference of the Islamic Conference Organization.

After all, the provisions of its charter includes a commitment to support the struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for the restoration of their rights and the liberation of their lands, and also to adopt the necessary measures to maintain international peace and security. To forget this and allow themselves to be hypnotized by imperialist propaganda would mean following the lead of imperialist forces which have never been and never will be the Muslim peoples' friends.

SMIRNOV: 1980 OLYMPICS 'UNTHINKABLE' WITHOUT U.S. ATHLETES

NC011534 Paris AFP in English 1529 GMT 1 Feb 80 NC

[Text] Paris, Feb 1 (AFP)--This year's summer Olympics "are unthinkable" without the presence of American athletes, Vice-President of the Moscow Games Organising Committee Vitaliy Smirnov said here today. Mr Smirnov made the comment at a press conference here, the first given by a senior Soviet sports official since the USSR's intervention in Afghanistan and U.S. President Jimmy Carter's games boycott appeal. Mr Smirnov said his organising committee was "counting on the good sense of American athletes and was certain that they would reflect before taking the decision not to go to Moscow." At the same time, he regretted the "false parallel" between sports and politics. Mr Smirnov, stopping over in Paris on his way to Lake Placid, New York State, for the winter Olympics later this month, insisted that the Olympic movement "admits no outside influence although life shows that politics and sport often have meeting points."

However he refused to comment on President Carter's ultimatum to withdraw the Americans from the games unless Soviet troops pull out of Afghanistan by the end of February. "I refuse to assume here the responsibilities of commander in chief of the Soviet Armed Forces," Mr Smirnov commented.

Mr Smirnov, who is also a Soviet member of the International Olympic Committee, said he "regretted" that numerous other countries had supported the American boycott call. "The Olympic Charter forces no-one to participate in the games, but the conditions imposed on the United States team have nothing to do with the Olympic ideal," he said. The absence of American and other athletes would considerably reduce the level of competition in Moscow, he added. Appealing to American athletes, Mr Smirnov said: "One must also understand sport and to have practiced it to know the hardship and the ascetic life lived by athletes if they are to have a chance, sometimes just once during their career, to take part in the games. "It is for that reason that sport must remain the affair of sportsmen and that politics be left to politicians," he said.

Earlier Mr Smirnov had expressed confidence that the games would take place at Moscow, adding that work on all installations, including hotel complexes, was nearing completion. "We continue to prepare for the games in a climate of confidence," he said. Eighty per cent of all seats had already been sold, he added. Mr Smirnov paid tribute to the French Government, which so far has refused to join the boycott movement. "France taken a stand over the Moscow games which I can qualify personally as pro-Olympic," he commented.

Killanin Statement

LD021805 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Dublin, February 2, TASS--President of the International Olympic Committee Lord Killanin stated here that the right of housing the 22nd Olympics was granted to Moscow back in 1974 and that according to the Olympic regulations the games are to be held in 1980 precisely in Moscow. He stressed that it is only the International Olympic Committee and not any governmental organisation that can make decisions about the Olympics. He noted that sportsmen and not states participate in the Olympic games, and the national Olympic committees must preserve their autonomy and must be able to oppose the pressure brought on them.

THREAT NOT IMAGINARY USSR PLANS BUT 'QUITE REAL U.S. STEPS'

LD041159 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Feb 80 p 5 LD

[A. Petrov article: "Who Covets Other People's Oil?"]

[Text] Day after day representatives of the United States keep repeating the same thing, namely, that the USSR allegedly threatens the Middle and Near East countries, intends to seize oil fields there and to establish control over oil supply routes to Europe and the United States. Such statements are made by ministers and other high-ranking officials of the current Washington administration. They are not silenced either by the illogic in their reasoning or by the lack of proof to support their words.

They evidently believe that the aim justifies the means, and the United States' aim today is, obviously, to consolidate its military, political and economic penetration into this region, to establish a kind of trusteeship, or to be more exact, military and economic domination, over the states of the region and their national natural wealth. It will be easier to do so, they think in Washington, if more people believe that the United States is saving somebody from something there.

Comrade L.I. Brezhnev said recently that the Soviet Union has no hostile intentions toward any state in the Near and Middle East. We would like to maintain friendly relations with all. The Soviet Union wishes well-being and prosperity to all the states of this region and the peoples living there.

The Soviet Union has never had and does not have now any intention to push its way to the warm seas. Limitation of military activity in the Indian Ocean with all its bays and straits, and termination of military rivalry in the zone would best meet our interests and our security, and the security of other countries adjacent to the region. If the arms race here continues, it is due only to the stand of the United States that, as is known, long has been building up month after month its military potential in the Indian Ocean.

Unlike some American statesmen who seek their own advantage in the disadvantage of others, the Soviet Union feels no satisfaction when it sees the difficulties experienced by the economies of certain Western states and the resultant privations for the broad masses. It never intended and does not intend to bring any disasters upon the peoples of the United States or Western Europe. The average American ought to know that all tales about the perfidious Russian plans to seize Middle Eastern oil fields are nothing more than political trickery, attempts to channel in another direction public discontent with energy and fuel supply difficulties which arise in Western countries because of the predatory policies of international monopolies.

Unlike the United States, our country has never claimed other people's oil resources, nor has it ever declared oil-containing areas a "sphere of its vital interests." The Soviet Union thought in advance about the development of its own sources of energy, and as for oil, it fully supplies its own needs. Not a single Soviet representative has ever said or could have said that the Soviet Union intends to establish control over other people's oil or intends to dictate to other countries the terms on which they should supply oil to the world market. Statements of this kind have come and continue to come from the U.S. Government. These are not just statements. They are supported these days by corresponding military demonstrations in the Persian Gulf and by economic and political blackmail, for example, with regard to Iran.

The present policy of the United States in world affairs is explained in many respects by the inordinate appetites of that country's imperialist circles, their claims to oil and raw materials belonging to other peoples. Not imaginary plans that are ascribed by American propaganda to the Soviet Union, but quite real steps by the U.S. Government--therein lies the real cause of tension, the real threat to other states and peoples.

5-YEAR MILITARY PLAN GIVES 'QUICK REACTION COMPLEX' IMPETUS

LD011531 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Correspondent M. Sturua article: "Quick Reaction Complex"]

[Text] Washington--The quick reaction complex? Can it be that a mistake has crept into the title? Can it be that we are talking about the "quick reaction corps" or what amounts to the same--about the "quick reaction forces", created by Washington to suppress the national-liberation movement of peoples? No, everything is as it should be in the title. It reflects precisely the essential content of the following report, which tells how the military-industrial complex quickly reacted to the proclamation of the "Carter doctrine" and rapidly passed on from words to action.

The "Carter doctrine" is a comparatively new term in Washington's political vocabulary. Its formal "birthday" is considered to be President Carter's speech to the Business Council on December 12 last year, in which he announced a new American 5-year program for further stepping up the arms race. What is more, this program, seasoned with certain strategic and geopolitical "spices", actually proclaimed the right of the United States to armed interference in practically any region of the globe it thinks fit. In short, he announced that Washington intends to regain its role of world gendarme.

The stick which is being placed in the gendarme's hands is called the "quick reaction forces". With the aim of creating these forces, 1981 will see the start of the building of an armada of CX transport planes, capable of conveying marines and army units to the Persian Gulf region and other "troublespots" of the world. Also envisaged is the creation of a fleet of military transport ships for prepositioning, which will patrol the waters around the Near East and other regions, "where conflicts may break out" (a more than elastic formula). Finally the military program envisages a "modernization of forces necessary for non-nuclear warfare" and strengthening the American "presence" in the Pacific and Indian oceans.

Special attention must be drawn to the following fact--the "Carter doctrine" was proclaimed and elaborated not after but before the well-known events in Afghanistan. They were not the cause nor even propaganda's pretext, but the effect of the implementation of this doctrine in the form of imperialist interference by the United States in the internal affairs of our neighbor. Recent facts--the events in Iran and Afghanistan, the headlong creation of a new system of military bases by Washington, the acceleration of new long-term arms programs--convincingly evidence that the "Carter doctrine" is an attempt to revive President Theodore Roosevelt's "big stick" policy at the juncture of the seventies and eighties.

The troubadours of imperialism and colonialism have let themselves go altogether and the knights of the cold war and of the arms race no longer consider it necessary to pull down the visor of propagandist rhetoric about peace and other lofty topics. [paragraph continues]

Interference--rapid and in all corners of the globe--with a view to suppressing the national-liberation movement of the peoples and of protecting the colonial interests of the dollar empire, interference using not only American weapons but also American Armed Forces--is becoming Washington's new official doctrine.

And now let us proceed to the "quick reaction complex." As the Washington POST writes, "Jimmy Carter has lubricated the motor of the war industry." This "lubrication" has been thorough, generous, and has cost many billions and the motor of the military-industrial complex has begun to work at full power. General Dynamics--a very big military contractor of the Pentagon's, has already begun creating aircraft, specially designated for sale to American satellites in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The companies McDonnell Douglas, United Technologies, Lockheed and Boeing are already calculating their profits from equipping the "quick reaction forces".

The Litton company, which has already earned billions on building destroyers, has joined in the implementation of Carter's 5-year plan, which now envisages the creation of 95 warships and not 67 as earlier envisaged. And altogether President Carter has "promised" to bring U.S. naval strength up to 550 ships by 1990. (For comparison let us point out that by the end of the current fiscal year the U.S. Navy will have 462 ships.) Moreover, there is a tendency towards building big, costly ships, like the Nimitz class aircraft carriers, Aegis destroyers, Trident submarines fitted with Trident II missiles (the program will cost $8 billion) and so forth. It is stressed that the program for increasing U.S. naval might, so to speak, brings together the two basic prongs of the "Carter doctrine"-- one directed against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries (strategic and Eurostrategic weapons), and the second directed against the developing countries for suppressing the national-liberation movement of the peoples (the "quick reaction corps").

The "Carter doctrine" is a quite an extensive reservoir for the military-industrial complex. So, the selfsame General Dynamics builds F-16 fighters, missiles, nuclear submarines and "has emerged at top of the shortlist" for the receipt of the order for building air-launched cruise missiles, (the order is worth $3 billion). According to General Dynamics Vice President Beggs "millions more dollars will flow into our companies safes if Carter fully implements his plan to create a more than 100,000-strong quick reaction corps."

As for the companies McDonnel Douglas, United Technologies and Lockheed, they intend to make a profit from building of transport planes for the "quick reaction corps". The company Pratt and Whitney, a daughter enterprise of United Technologies will receive an order for manufacturing engines for the CX transport planes, while the Lockheed company will be entrusted with building the planes themselves. Let us remember that according to "Carter's 5-year plan", $6 billion are being appropriated for building 50 CX transport planes. "We are optimistic," Lockheed Vice Chairman Richard Cook says. "We are optimistic," Boeing Vice Chairman Harry Goldie echoes.

The "sea dogs" are also in related mood. In particular, (Leonard Erb), chairman of the Ingolls company, a branch of Litton Industries, testifies to this. The modernization of the strategic submarine forces is a very costly undertaking. But work has already been started in the United States on the first new Trident submarines system. As for the new missiles of the same name with a range of more than 4,000 miles, they are already at sea. Finally to crown everything, there is the construction of the Nimitz class aircraft carriers, which will cost over $2 billion "apiece."

As has already been reported, U.S. military expenditures in fiscal 1981 will exceed $157 billion. This is almost $20 billion more than military appropriations originally requested by the administration for the current fiscal year. Subsequent years of the 5-year arms race devised by Carter, a constant annual 4.5-5 percent increase military expenditure, in "real" terms, that is, taking inflation into account, is envisaged. The military-industrial complex is ecstatic at the prospect. On the New York Stock Exchange that is currently reminiscent of a ward for the violently insane in a psychiatric hospital, only the shares of the military concerns are flourishing. The "traders in death" are openly applauding Washington.

But the appetite of the military-industrial complex is unsated. This same "5-year Carter plan" is regarded by them as merely a beginning. "We simply cannot wish the world to be a peaceful place," a highly placed Pentagon representative frankly says. But apologists of the military-industrial complex explain that for protracted boom "it is necessary to hammer out today's rhetoric into tomorrow's contracts," that is to pass on from words to action. Insofar as the creation of a production unit and the development of new, technically complex weapons requires years, if not decades, the industrial-military complex calls on Washington to give it "guarantees" that during this period there will be no thaw in the international atmosphere to hinder the new cycle of the arms race now set in motion.

And apparently Washington is ready to give such "guarantees" to the military-industrial complex. The atmosphere created on the Capitol, in particular, provides quite convincing evidence of this. Congress, which has resumed work after the Christmas recess, has already been given the significant and provocative title of the "post-Afghan" Congress. As parliamentarians themselves say, "we went off on vacation with the issue of ratification of the SALT II treaty on the agenda, and we are returning from vacation to approve our military programs." You cannot put it more precisely. Apart from the military programs enumerated above, Congress also has on its agenda the granting of military aid to Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and possibly Turkey. After all, even quite recently, Congress was taking a negative stance on all three issues. As one congressman declared, "if we begin to cram Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Turkey with arms, we must shelve human rights as the cornerstone of our foreign policy." An important admission: the "post-Afghan" Congress, under pressure from the military-industrial complex, is casting aside even the fig-leaf of discourse about defense of human rights. Finally, it is expected that Congress will consider favorably the plans for "increasing the flexibility" of the CIA in conducting subversive operations abroad, for restoring universal conscription "by the back door" and also for increasing salaries of servicemen at the expense and to the detriment of employees of civilian establishments.

Yes, the bosses of the military-industrial complex want even the Capitol to keep pace with their appetites and everything proposed by the administration--be it B-1 bombers, the neutron bomb, MX missiles, in short everything you please--to pass through Congress without a hitch. This, Senator McGovern states, reflects a deplorable return to the way of thinking current in cold war times.

The decisions, which the military-industrial complex intends the drag through Congress, are not dictated by the U.S. national interests. They are being imposed on the country by the quick reaction complex--military monopolies, Pentagon generals, political "hawks," and their propaganda machine. These decisions have never made nor can make sense, for they pursue the narrowly mercenary aims of American imperialism.

QUICK REACTION CORPS DESIGNED FOR WORLDWIDE INTERVENTION

LD311047 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[S. Zykov article: "The Fire-Setting Brigade"]

[Text] A "quick reaction corps" is being hurriedly knocked together in the United States. Newspapers are printing dozens of articles devoted to this latest Pentagon "invention." President Carter also devoted great attention to its creation in his recent Business Council speech--in it he set out the bases of an extravagant new U.S. military program for the next 5 years.

In Washington's thinking the new formation is intended to activate American military policy and strengthen the U.S. "military presence" in various regions of the world. The "quick reaction forces," consisting of 110,000 picked and specially trained officers and enlisted men, is to secure U.S. "national" interests, according to the official line, in all the world's "hot spots."

Let us note in this connection that the list of U.S. "national" interests is as extensive as their geography is wide: partner states in military blocs; regions rich in raw materials and energy resources and the relevant transportation routes; countries where American monopolies have major investments or where dictatorial regimes convenient to Washington are in power--the transatlantic strategists unreservedly include all these in the zones of U.S. military, political and economic interests. National liberation movements on any continent, however, are perceived by Washington as a direct "threat" to these interests.

U.S. claims to the role of "world gendarme" have been backed hiterto mainly through a far-flung system of American military bases on other countries' territories and large naval fleets kept constantly at sea in the Atlantic, the Pacific, the Mediterranean and other areas. According to official Pentagon figures there are 2,500 U.S. military bases and military sites and almost half a million American servicemen abroad. They are located in 114 countries--from Panama to South Korea, from Greenland to Italy and from Japan to Australia.

Even now Washington is not giving up military bases but, on the contrary, is striving to expand the network. American missions have recently held talks in Saudi Arabia, Kenya, Somalia, Oman and other African and Near East countries seeking to acquire or at least "rent" naval and air bases.

However, American strategists consider that Washington's desire to interfere in events taking place thousands of kilometers from the United States and in the internal affairs of independent states requires additional efforts. Under modern conditions military blocs like NATO and military bases on foreign territory are no longer enough for the American hegemonists. The need has arisen, U.S. Defense Secretary H. Brown stated frankly, to transfer combat armed forces large distances by sea or by air fast enough to "gain control in a conflict," as the Pentagon chief put it. The "quick reaction corps," also called the "Pentagon fire brigade" by the newspapers, is to serve as just such an instrument of the military intervention policy.

The idea of creating the "quick reaction forces" was conceived inside the Pentagon some time ago, but events in Iran, the revolution in Nicaragua and the intensification of the peoples' struggle in Africa, Asia and Latin America gave impetus to its realization. [paragraph continues]

A joint task force has already been created with headquarters at MacDill base, Florida, with the task of planning and preparing "quick reaction corps" operations. A system has also been set up for constituting the corps. According to H. Brown again, the corps forces will be made up at need from different units of all categories of troops--from brigade to army corps. The role of main strike force is assigned to the marines.

Washington is currently stinting no money or efforts to prepare the corps and equip it with materials and hardware as quickly as possible. A considerable proportion of the enormous [additional] military expenditure envisaged for the next 5 years of approximately $10 billion will be spent on the construction of specialized ships and military transport aircraft. Loaded with heavy weapons, ammunition and food supplies, these ships will be kept at sea or in ports of countries "friendly" to the United States closest to possible areas of American military intervention. There are plans to create a fleet of large transport aircraft capable of ferrying tanks and other arms over intercontinental distances.

Hundreds of millions of dollars are being allocated to strengthen and rearm units to be used in the "quick reaction forces" and to modernize mobile artillery, tanks, helicopters and other arms. Meanwhile intensive training of these units has already begun for action in "hot spots." Thus the Barstow military base in California's Mojave Desert, where during World War II General Patton of the American 3d Army prepared for the North Africa landing, has come to life again. Battalion after battalion of airborne landing troops and marines are now training there under conditions as close as possible to the situation in the Near East and the Persian Gulf region.

There have been a number of combined exercises by naval, air and ground units rehearsing joint surprise landing actions against "enemy" territory. AP indicates that the corps is designed "not only for 'conventional' military intervention in foreign states but also for resolving 'specific' tasks such as capturing oilfields and other strategically important targets, suppressing national liberation movements and strengthening regimes convenient to Washington."

The hurried formation of the "quick reaction corps" graphically illustrates American imperialism's aggressive aims. The U.S. expansionist plans make nonsense of Washington's hypocritical statements of supposed concern for strengthening peace and the peoples' security. The "fire brigades" created by the Pentagon are intended by no means for extinguishing but for setting fires of military conflict in different regions of the world.

CARTER WILL HARM ONLY OWN COUNTRY BY OLYMPIC BOYCOTT

LD311321 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Jan 80 p 3 LD

[Article by Mikhail Ozerov under the rubric "Fabrications and Facts": "A Goal in his Own Net?"]

[Text] ...Intercepting the ball, the captain forges forward.

But what's this? Suddenly he turns round and runs toward his own goal. His teammates stand open-mouthed. [paragraph continues]

One of them recovers sufficiently to shout: "Have you gone mad?" The others dash toward him, grabbing his arms, pulling at his shorts, ripping his shirt.

It was no longer soccer. In the penalty area they kicked, punched and bit each other. But the captain broke free and forced the ball across the line.

Go-o-al! But there was no applause. There was an angry rumbling in the stands....

Soccer connoisseurs will rack their brains in vain to recall the date and venue of this match--it is not recorded in the history of sport. Nevertheless, something like it is actually taking place now; certain people are clearly trying to score an own goal.

Of course, the Olympics are not a soccer game, but what we are hearing from certain psychological warfare centers is an attempt to turn games of sport into political games.

Having invented the slanderous myth of the Soviet "invasion" of Afghanistan, Washington is now speculating like mad on it in an attempt to do as much damage as possible to our country. It has imposed a grain embargo. It has postponed the ratification of the SALT II treaty. It is organizing provocation after provocation against Soviet people working in the United States or arriving there by sea and air. It is still trying to wreck the Moscow Olympics. It cannot accept, it is quite incapable of accepting the fact that Moscow--the capital of a great sporting power--has been entrusted with the organization of this festival. As a "punishment," it is calling for an Olympic boycott or the transfer of the Olympics to another location. "A country that commits aggression must not hold the Olympics!" is the heart-rending cry from the banks of the Potomac.

Slander is a favorite method of the American administration when it wants to get its own way. Another "top-of-the bill" method--and we are seeing this again--is crude pressure. Pressure on allies: They are being recommended to "fall in with the United States," and it is hinted that the White House could accept a considerable proportion of the expense if the Olympics are switched. Pressure on its own sportsmen: Saying that the authorities will not issue passports to U.S. Olympic team members. Pressure on the U.S. Olympic Committee: Mind you don't "diverge from the official line."

The transatlantic big brother is echoed by the British authorities. But the other West European states, not to mention countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, remember the repeated declarations by U.S. statesmen themselves that the Olympic movement must be "free from politics," and they rightly accuse Washington of hypocrisy. A number of papers print articles on this theme under identical headlines: "Don't Mix Politics with Sport!", "No to American Blackmail!"

The whole gamut of West European press organs also writes that the intrigues of the Moscow Olympics' enemies are undermining the international climate. "An Olympic blockade would mean a return to the cold war," the Paris paper LA LIBERATION warns.

The paper's alarm is understandable: It is in Europe that detente, which Washington is in such a rush to bury at the moment, has borne the best fruit.

What do the actual American "team" members think about their "captain's" feint?

"I have been training for 3 and 1/2 years to get into the Olympic team, and I certainly want to go to Moscow," Olympic champion A. Oerter said. This is the wish of other American sportsmen (10,000 of them are participating in the final Olympic trials, and the best 500 will make up the team). Think of the effort they have put into their training! But now their plans and hopes are in jeopardy.

"We are merely a tool in the politicians' hands," well-known marathon runner B. Rogers told journalists bitterly. Senator E. Kennedy stressed in a speech that the Olympic games "cannot be an element of our foreign policy."

Americans are aware that their country's authorities have embarked on another machination for their own political ends and entered into a completely unsporting game, even if it has a bearing on sport.

Washington's "sanctions" will not only rebound on U.S. sportsmen. "They are a double-edged sword. In fact our country is the organizer of the winter Olympics at Lake Placid and of the next summer Olympics," D. Miller, executive director of the U.S. Olympic Committee, warned.

A serious warning. Those who make American policy on Capitol Hill ought to think on that. In fact the International Olympic Committee (IOC) has decreed that a country which boycotts the Olympics can be barred from participating in the next games.

They should also listen to IOC President Lord Killanin and the representatives of Olympic committees in Italy, Spain, the FRG, Japan, Denmark, Mexico and many other countries, who have said that Washington is going to split international sports.

Throughout the world people are saying: There is not the slightest reason for boycotting the Olympics or switching them to another location. "The Olympic games," France's NICE-MATIN writes, "will take place in Moscow in any event, and if the Americans do not take part it will be seen by the whole world as a U.S. defeat."

Yes, the Olympic games will take place in Moscow and will be a great festival. This is what the fans want as well as the sportsmen. Thousands, tens of thousands of people are preparing to go to the games to meet with Muscovites and to see our country for themselves. They will come; they will be neither intimidated nor dissuaded.

Soviet people are also eagerly awaiting the Olympics and, as Leonid Ilich Brezhnev said, "they will do all they can to insure high standards and to impart fresh impetus to the noble ideas of friendship and peace."

...However, the "captain" in his stars-and-stripes uniform is reluctant at the moment to heed the voice of reason, the warnings of his team members and the angry rumblings in the stands and, alientating everybody, he is bent on kicking the ball into...his own net.

U.S. SEEKS TO USE PAKISTAN AGAINST AFGHAN REVOLUTION

LD011151 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[V. Svetlov article: "U.S. Representatives' Journey to Pakistan"]

[Text] A White House spokesman has announced that, on orders from the U.S. President, his adviser Brzezinski and U.S. Deputy Secretary of State Christopher accompanied by Assistant Secretary of Defense McGiffert are to go to Islamabad. They have been assigned the task of conducting an exchange of views with the Pakistani leadership on "the situation in the region."

Brzezinski and the other U.S. representatives are in no way going to Pakistan to seek ways to reduce tension. Their aim is to lay a long-term foundation for the policy of U.S. interference in the affairs both of Pakistan itself and of other Near East and Middle East countries. They are going as inciters, as the creators and at the same time the executors of plans which have absolutely nothing in common with safeguarding peace, prosperity and stability in this region. They are setting off across two oceans to restate noisily U.S. claims to "special rights" in Southeast Asia and the Near East and to indulge in saber-rattling again.

In deference to the times, the U.S. administration states that "joint actions" are preferable and is now engaged in seeking candidates prepared to join the aggressive U.S. course. Pakistan and a number of Arab and African countries are being railroaded into the new U.S. bloc which is being knocked together using the carrot and the stick, as they say. If they do not want to "defend themselves" together with the United States, the Americans will "defend" whomever they have to despite their wishes, since Washington warns, U.S. "vital interests are at stake." It intimidates them with the possible use of force if for external or internal reasons events take a turn which the U.S. rulers regard as unfavorable.

All the indications are that the pressure is making an impression on some governments. Is Pakistan giving thought to where Washington is dragging this country or what hostility with Afghanistan and the expansion of the use of Pakistani territory against the Afghan people could mean for Pakistan? After all, it is a case of real aggression against Afghanistan in which tens of thousands of mercenaries are taking part, making use of Pakistan--aggression unleashed in the immediate vicinity of the USSR.

The United States is also trying to involve Saudi Arabia in Pakistan's military "development" [osvoyeniye]. It is floating the idea of Saudi "special interests" in Pakistan which link Saudi Arabia and Pakistan together.

Saudi Arabia already covers a large proportion of the expenses connected with training and arming mercenaries and sending them to Afghanistan. That is not enough for Washington. It is not averse to making its policy more acceptable to the Muslim countries by means of Saudi Arabia's participation in turning Pakistan into a stronghold of U.S. imperialism in this part of the world.

Probably not everyone likes the revolution in Afghanistan. But that is no reason to launch an undeclared war against Democratic Afghanistan. This is no reason to deny Democratic Afghanistan the right to individual and collective self-defense. It is no reason to blow up the Afghan events and turn the entire region into a hotbed of tension posing a danger not only to the states actually in that region.

The present Washington leadership has acquired a taste for playing with fire. They are playing this game recklessly [s azartom], evidently reckoning that if anything happens it is not the United States which will pay but someone else, since they are running matters 15,000 miles from their own home.

ZORIN ON CRONKITE, AFGHANISTAN, 'ANTI-SOVIET HYSTERIA'

LD030251 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

["Moscow Viewpoint" commentary by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] When I'm in the United States and speaking to various audiences or appearing on television, I'm often introduced as Professor Valentin Zorin, the Soviet Walter Cronkite. Once I corrected the person who made this introduction with a kidding remark that Walter Cronkite is the American Valentin Zorin. Of course I said that in fun and had no intentions of boosting my own prestige or of minimizing the qualities of such a popular man in your country as Walter Cronkite.

But I must admit that if someone were to make that same introduction of me today I wouldn't repeat my joke. It's not that I am dissillusioned with Walter Cronkite's professional talent. I've had much respect for the man for many years and think he is a fine TV news analyst and I've always liked his forthrightness and disdain for political profiteering. But Walter Cronkite's recent remarks about the situation in Afghanistan are upsetting and puzzling to those who are accustomed to thinking of him as a journalist with an uncompromising conscience and a stickler for the facts.

The American mass media as a rule don't get involved in polemics with my comments on this program; they apparently don't want to call attention to my viewpoint. But I hope that what I am going to say today will not only reach those who usually listen to Radio Moscow but will get back to Mr Cronkite. I've seen special State Department transcripts of our programs and I know they are sent to many places, including the editorial offices of leading newspapers and TV stations.

Now Walter Cronkite and some other news analysts in the United States have a reputation for avoiding deliberate lies, so I can see only one or two explanations for the comments Mr Cronkite has been making about Afghanistan of late. Either he just doesn't have the facts or he has voluntarily put his prestige in the hands of those who are looking for reelection and has turned to the dishonorable job of undermining efforts to ease international tension.

I've heard several recent talks by Walter Cronkite. I won't go into all that he has said that makes those who've always trusted him shrug in disbelief; I'll just mention one of his recent reports on CBS in which he told millions of viewers that Soviet rubles have replaced Afghan money in Kabul. Unfortunately, this misinformation is typical of what the mass media are feeding the American people.

I'd like to address Mr Cronkite. Just where did you get that utter nonsense, Walter? How could you stoop so low? Why, after so many years on the job, did you tell such a crude lie? After seeing that you fooled those who are accustomed to trusting you, why didn't you feel it necessary to apologize and correct the blunder you made either intentionally or otherwise? I must admit I'm stumped. I can't believe that Walter Cronkite, who has seen so much and who maintained his professional and personal integrity even during the McCarthy era and the days of the cold war, could at the last stage of his career suddenly become as naive as a newborn baby and accept any lie that's thrown his way, obviously by self-seeking people. It's just as difficult to believe that Mr Cronkite would give in to any kind of pressure. After all, he maintained integrity during the dirty war in Vietnam and the Watergate scandal. I certainly wouldn't want to think that at the end of many years of work that have earned him worldwide respect, Walter Cronkite or some of his other prominent colleagues have undertaken to stop the relaxation of international tension. Who but an experienced political analyst should know better that there is no sensible alternative to the policy of easing international tension or to peaceful coexistance between our two countries?

It certainly is not an acceptable alternative to bring about the danger of a nuclear missile conflict as some groups in the United States are doing because of their selfish and temporary interests.

Walter, you're not the one who is going to stand before the electorate in November and as far as I know your income doesn't depend on the big orders being filled by armaments companies in the United States. So what's the fuss about? Just a few months ago I saw Walter Cronkite in Vienna. I watched him at work and heard what he was reporting from Vienna. So what happened? What's the reason for the sudden transformation?

If Walter Cronkite wanted to answer me, he'd no doubt talk about the so-called aggressive actions of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, but I think that such an answer wouldn't explain anything. First of all, what's going on in Afghanistan is altogether different from what officials in Washington are saying and what the American mass media are saying. And Cronkite and his colleagues, who are all very well informed, know the truth. They know that the events in Afghanistan were only an excuse and not the cause of the political changes that Washington began long before the end of December last year.

Since the first efforts to ease tension were made, the policy met with fierce resistance and various excuses were produced to upset that policy. Last year, for instance, every opportunity was taken to whip up an anti-Soviet campaign and to stir up suspicion and mistrust of the Soviet Union and, in the end, to undermine efforts to ease international tension. When opportunities didn't arise of themselves, excuses were invented. One pretext for anti-Soviet propaganda was supplied by the Russian monarchist, Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, who insulted the memory of 20 million Soviet people lost in the war against the Nazis by singing praises to the collaborator, General Vlasov, a traitor to his homeland. Other issues used for anti-Soviet propaganda had to do with dissidents, Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union, the absurd accusations of Soviet military presence in Cuba and many, many others. Even the decision a Bolshoy ballet dancer made to leave the USSR caused a stir that involved government leaders in Washington and the United Nations ambassador.

Has there been 1 week recently or even 1 day when the American mass media didn't find an excuse to carry on their anti-Soviet campaign? I don't remember such a day or week.

The colleagues of Mr Cronkite have spent many months tripping over themselves to report on so-called violations of human rights in the Soviet Union but none of them has shown any desire to discuss the genuine violations of human rights that Washington's pals are guilty of on a wide scale--the tragedy of Chile, the barbaric bombings of Kampuchea by United States aircraft, the crimes of the vicious dictator Somoza and the bloody crimes of Washington's pet dictator, the shah of Iran, whose health was of such concern to David Rockefeller and Jimmy Carter. They don't come under the category of violating human rights, if we are to judge from the American mass media, yet the fate of a few dozen renegades punished by courts of law which proved them guilty of breaking Soviet laws was perfect material for anti-Soviet hysteria. You don't have to have the political experience and professional skill of Walter Cronkite to see the shaky foundation those who are against easing political tension are standing on. However, those who are perhaps unintentionally, but quite possibly intentionally, serving the enemies of the relaxation of political tension should know from experience that they are involved in a dirty and very dangerous game.

It's absolutely impossible to force such a powerful nation as the Soviet Union to back down by hard pressure and blackmail from Washington or to change the current balance of strength in the world by withholding grain shipments or by threatening to boycott the Moscow Olympic games.

But it's quite possible to hurt the basic interests of the American people and to jeopardize their security. Those who shape public opinion have a special responsibility. They don't have the moral right to surrender to emotions of the moment and to hysteria. They mustn't forget the simple and unalterable truth that in this nuclear missile age of ours there is no sensible alternative to the policy of easing political tension and promoting peaceful coexistence. Those who forget this bear a grave responsibility to their own people and run the risk of leaving behind a most unfavorable memory to future generations--if civilization lasts that long.

DANGEROUS INCIDENTS REGARDING SOVIET PLANES IN U.S. DENOUNCED

Court To Consider Sabotage

LD031805 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Six air-traffic controllers at New York airport are due to give evidence in court next week in connection with an act of sabotage against a Soviet plane. On 18 January, in the (?control) tower of this airport, the work of a computer was deliberately violated, as a result of which a Soviet aircraft coming in for a landing only by chance avoided a disaster.

Aeroflot Delay

LD041130 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 4 Feb 80 LD

[Excerpt] A Soviet passenger plane on a regular flight between New York and Moscow is being held up at Kennedy Airport since Sunday. The airport management has failed to insure its unloading, thus delaying the scheduled flight. It is the second incident involving a Soviet airliner at Kennedy Airport in just over a fortnight.

Rightist Course of Unions

LD011340 Moscow in English to North America 0000 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Igor Gayevskiy commentary]

[Text] Steps have been taken to disrupt regular flights by the Soviet airline, Aeroflot. The rightwing leaders of the AFL-CIO were involved in these and other anti-Soviet actions. Here is comment from observer Igor Gayevskiy:

Such actions get approval from the extreme rightwing United States circles that have always been opposed to the American labor movement, but brazen anti-Sovietism blinds some rightwing leaders of the AFL-CIO so much that they overlook their alinement with the antiworker and antilabor forces. The past decades have clearly shown who benefits by such a policy and who suffers from it. In the late forties the rightwing leaders like Green and Meany fully approved Washington's cold war policy against the Soviet Union. They did not conceal their goals either. If we actively support Washington's foreign policy, they assured, this would consolidate our domestic position. But that expectation proved to be shortsighted. As a result of this policy much damage was done to the American interests. Almost half the states adopted antilabor and anti-democratic legislation including Taft-Hartley and Griffin laws and also legislation about the right to work. This took place because the labor bosses sacrificed the independence in politics and doomed themselves to the role of junior partners dependent on the policymakers.

In the sixties the AFL-CIO leaders fully backed the dirty war in Vietnam. The reactionary press praised what it called union patriotism and responsibility, but having linked themselves with the policy of the military-industrial complex the AFL-CIO bosses actually deprived the working people and the labor unions of their chief weapon, political independence, and carried on their practice of (?begging) handouts from big business and the ruling circles. All through the seventies big business waged an all-out offensive on the vital interests of the working people and on the unions' rights. The policy of the AFL-CIO leadership led to a sharp decline in the number of working people united in labor unions. As a result, the United States labor unions now have in their ranks less than 20 percent of the working people, which is less than at any time over the last 40 years and less than in any Western country. Big business has prevented Congress from passing all the bills that the labor unions have pressed for and has begun to pursue a tougher course toward strikes. The corporations make no secret of their plans to continue their offensive on the labor movement and on the gains of the working people, but instead of mobilizing the workers for actions against the reduction of spending on social needs, against the corporations' offensive on the working man's vital interests, the AFL-CIO leaders are trying to distract the Americans' attention by reckless anti-Soviet actions.

OBSERVER DISCUSSES CARTER DRAFT REGISTRATION PROPOSAL

LD030303 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] President Carter's plan to resume registration for compulsory military service has predictably raised protests throughout the United States. The loudest protests so far came from American students who demonstrated this week at three major United States universities--Columbia, Yale and Berkeley. With a look at the President's plan to reinstate draft registration here is our observer, Yuriy Reshetnikov:

When President Carter announced his plans to register young Americans for draft his measure was bound to get emotional response. As is known, the U.S. Armed Forces have been dependent on voluntary enlistment since the draft was abolished in 1973. And it was abolished at a time, you will recall, when the Vietnam war was drawing to an end and feelings were running high in the United States against the military in general. In addition to that the so-called post-Vietnam era was setting in with everyone accusing everyone else for the U.S. debacle in Vietnam with the accusing finger pointing mostly at the politicians and the brass hats. And although some military officials tried complaining about the new status of the U.S. Army few politicians with any commonsense would dare do anything to support the military.

Now the post-Vietnam era seems to be dead and gone and the brass hats are riding high again. All it took was a few years' time and some patience on the part of the American military. It is not that they had been made to suffer all those years. Detente or none, the Defense Department by and large has been able to get what it was after and particularly so with the Carter administration. All the sweet preelection talk of cutting down on military spendings was all but forgotten as soon as the present administration moved into the White House in 1977 and so military spendings soared. They were expected to reach an all-time record high of more than $158 billion in the fiscal 1981.

That is more than 5 percent over the President's request for fiscal 1980. And President Carter, in his State of the Union Message last week, said he would ask Congress for the money to finance registration of young people for military service.

This measure announced by the chief executive seems to me quite consistent with the administration's heavy emphasis on military spending. Indeed, the scope of the extensive military programs now under way and future plans announced by the President in his State of the Union address would naturally require manpower far in excess of what could be provided by the present voluntary enlistments. It appears that a military career in the United States is not quite the kind of occupation that many young Americans would choose, hence the necessity to discard the idea of a voluntary army. But, of course, dealing with an emotional issue such as this you had better watch your step; after almost 7 years of voluntary enlistment it would come as a shock to many Americans switching over to a draft. So the administration wisely announced only a plan to resume registration for compulsory military service. Even so there has been swift reaction to any idea of such registration. And perhaps surprisingly enough for the administration it came initially from college students who are not old enough to know much about the U.S. war in Vietnam and the unseemly role of the military there, which was admittedly one of the major reasons to abolish draft in the post-Vietnam era. But like most of its current military programs, the U.S. administration apparently hopes to sell the idea of eventual draft registration to the public in the guise of measures meant to counter alleged Soviet military threat.

This is an old ruse which has proved indispensable over the years and which has yielded remarkable results in the United States. And of late the administration has spared no effort to whip up anti-Soviet sentiments among its citizens.

It is not very hard to predict where such policies are going to lead us. It happened in the past and it looks as if this may happen again. The word for it is confrontation and it is up to the American administration to decide whether or not this happens once again.

TASS CORRESPONDENT DENOUNCES 'SUBVERSIVE' VOICE OF AMERICA

LD302330 Moscow TASS in International Service in Russian 1731 GMT 30 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, 30 January, TASS--TASS correspondent Vitaliy Gan reports:

The U.S. President has announced his decision to appoint Mary Bitterman as director of the Voice of America radio station, the mouthpiece of Washington's foreign political and ideological diversions. She will replace P. Strauss, who left last October because of disagreements with the White House, which expressed acute displeasure over the increasingly frequent failures of the subversive station. In connection with the course adopted by the administration in rejecting relaxation of international tension and resurrecting the "cold war", the new director, observers claim, is faced with the specific task of sharply stepping up the "psychological offensive," which the radio station has actually been engaged in since the moment of its inception. According to directives from Z. Brzezinski, assistant to the U.S. President for national security affairs, the Voice of America in the new conditions must wage a "more insistent offensive" against the socialist countries in the sphere of ideology. The significance attached to this subversive radio station by U.S. ruling circles is indicated at a minimum by the fact that Washington every year allocates increased funds for its requirements. In the present fiscal year the Voice of America budget has been increased to $82.8 million. A further $10-15 million increase is envisaged for next year. The change in the radio station's management means no withdrawal from the old discredited methods of the "fight for minds," resorted to by the Washington radio subversives. Out-and-out lies, slander against the socialist system, disinformation and direct interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign states--this entire "arsenal" continues to remain at Washington's service, and, it is expected, in the atmosphere of anti-Soviet hysteria whipped up in the country, it will be used even more intensively for the purpose of poisoning the entire international climate.

BANDURA SCORES JAPANESE 'PACIFIC COMMUNITY' EFFORTS

ID011343 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Correspondent Yu. Bandura report: "Facts Versus Words"]

[Text] Tokyo--Japanese Prime Minister M. Ohira has completed an official visit to Australia and New Zealand--the first visit to those countries by a Japanese head of government in the last 6 years.

A wide range of questions concerning both Japan's bilateral relations with each of the Pacific countries and events in international life were touched on during the talks held in Canberra and Auckland. However, the Japanese head of government's main effort were expended in propagandizing the concepts of a "Pacific community," or in other words, in knocking together a bloc of capitalist countries in the Asian-Pacific region under Japan's auspices and with the blessing of the United States. The question of the "Pacific community" was widley discussed in Australia and New Zealand and also in Papua-New Guinea, where M. Ohira paid an unofficial visit on his way back to Japan.

Judging from press reports, all three of Tokyo's partners in the talks adopted a generally favorable attitude to the plan put forward by Japan and expressed readiness to study it. Thus the concept of the "Pacific community" is beginning to be transformed from a collection of empty, flowing phrases into a factor in international policy (on an unofficial level Tokyo's proposals have already been submitted for examination by the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and are being discussed in Beijing and Washington). And this phenomenon can only give rise to increased concern among Asian peace-loving forces, the more so in view of the fact that the intention of transforming the planned "community" into an overtly aggressive bloc has recently become increasingly clear.

In particular, a report prepared by Japan's Foreign Policy Department the other day on Japanese-Australian relations in the eighties speaks quite unambigously of the need to step up military contacts between Tokyo and Canberra, from the exchange of military delegations to "cooperation in maintaining peace and stability in the region," that is, the virtual establishment of allied relations of a military nature.

These intentions are also shared by the Australian Government, whose head--Fraser--came out in favor of the "need to establish broad, profound relations of cooperation between Japan and Australia in all spheres (including the military)" not long before the meeting with Ohira. It was no accident that he linked the concept of the "Pacific community" with the joint maneuvers planned for the spring of this year by the naval forces of the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan. That large-scale operation of an overtly bellicose nature is the first concrete act of the military bloc which has not yet been formed but is in the process of being knocked together. And if that is what its first steps are like, it is not hard to imagine where they could lead the initiators of the "Pacific community."

Tokyo spares no effort to explain that the concept being pushed through by Japan pursues neither political nor military goals. These assurances would gain considerably more weight if they were backed up by actual actions. However, the facts indicate the opposite: Under cover of arguments about "building a new, Pacific civilization," trends only capable of subjecting peace and security in the Pacific to the most serious trials are gathering strength.

KABUL NEW TIMES DENOUNCES INTERNATIONAL IMPERIALISM

LD011624 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, February 1, TASS--While talking at length about "peace and justice" international imperialism with the United States at its head in reality strives wherever possible to interfere in the internal affairs of other states, to act against progressive regimes and movements wherever they appear in the world, writes the Kabul NEW TIMES.

For at least twelve years, the paper writes, Washington is professing an openly anti-Arab position and doing everything to strengthen Israel and perpetuate the occupation of Arab lands. The Camp David deal is an illustration of this stand of the United States. This deal deprives the almost four-million-strong Arab people of Palestine of the right to its land, of the right to live in its own homes. American imperialism has exposed itself also as an enemy of the Iranian people.

Today, Kabul NEW TIMES notes, the U.S. imperialists are trying at all cost to obstruct the Afghan people's successes, is regrouping the hostile forces concentrated along our borders, is giving them tremendous military and financial assistance. In the international arena imperialism again and again is resorting to the cold war tactics which brings with it a serious threat to peace in the region and in the whole world. This threat is not only in the U.S. decision to "rearm" Pakistan but also in the fact that on entering into a collusion with imperialism Beijing is exerting every effort to change the alignment of forces in the region, to arrest the progress of developing states.

But the gunboat diplomacy is inevitable doomed to failure, Kabul NEW TIMES stresses. Democratic Afghanistan has the trust and support both of the Afghan people and friends in the whole world who have helped our country and our people at an hour of trial.

AFGHANISTAN 'READY' FOR FRIENDSHIP WITH IRAN, PAKISTAN

LD041109 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Special correspondents P. Demchenko and L. Mironov dispatch: "Afghanistan: What the Facts Bear Out"]

[Text] Kabul, January--The reports reaching Kabul from Pakistan show that the enemies of Democratic Afghanistan are continuing to weave the threads of plots against it. Thus, one telegram speaks of a new attempt by reactionary Afghan groupings in exile to unite. The two previous rallies of these reactionary elements at the beginning of the month produced no results. In Pakistan recently the leaders of six counterrevolutionary groupings entrenched there announced the creation of a "united front."

Another telegram reports a session of the Islamic Conference Organization in Islamabad. Washington had a hand in both the former and the latter meeting, it is believed here. It was obviously under pressure from Washington that the far-fetched "Afghan question" was included on the session's agenda.

All this fuss is of a clearly pronounced pro-imperialist nature. The enemies of Democratic Afghanistan, under cover of religious slogans, are vainly trying to argue that the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] Government presents a "threat" to Islam and its neighbors--Iran and Pakistan. [paragraph continues]

The loudest cries of all are emanating from U.S. propaganda, which is counting on using this simple method to distract public opinion from the fact that it is precisely the United States which is the main patron of Israel--a country which has committed several acts of aggression against Muslim states and to this day occupies Arab lands and is oppressing the Palestinian people.

Let us turn to Afghanistan, however, let us recall that in the very first address to the people the new government created in December stated its unswerving desire to respect religion and believers. Only a few days ago--on 25 January--Bakrak Karmal, chairman of the Revolutionary Council and prime minister, addressed the people on radio and television, reaffirming loyalty to these principles. Moreover, the Afghan leader stated that all believers, mullahs, sheykhs and imams outside Afghanistan could return home.

In Kabul and the other Afghan cities and villages the day begins with the muezzin's call to morning prayer. Both in the capital and the outskirts which we visited we saw mosques working normally and people at prayer unimpeded. Last Friday the television broadcast a report from a mosque where many members of the Revolutionary Council, headed by its chairman, were praying.

One more example of Afghan life today. When, in early January, at the new government's decision, political prisoners were released from Pul-e Charkhi Prison they included two Sunnite priests--Ghulam Hassan Rahmati and Mohammad 'Ali. Later we met with them in Hosainiya Mosque in one of the capital's central regions. They said no one was putting any obstacles in their way.

And so, as we can see, accusations of religious persecutions in Afghanistan are simply a fabrication. But how do matters stand with respect to the danger it allegedly presents to its neighbors? Here, too, reality also refutes the fabrications of imperialist and Chinese propaganda.

In the past few weeks appeals have frequently been heard from Kabul for the establishment of goodneighbourly relations and for getting rid of the flotsam of the recent past. Here, for instance, is an extract from the DRA leadership's message to the Iranian leader Ayatollah Khomeyni: "Afghanistan sincerely wants to establish the closest relations of friendship and fraternity with the Islamic people of Iran. In our opinion there is no factor which could be a reason for differences between the friendly Muslim Afghan and Iranian peoples, between the DRA and the Islamic Republic of Iran. We are prepared to take immediate steps to eliminate any misunderstanding between us."

Similar measures have been taken with regard to Pakistan.

Bakrak Karmal said recently: "We want to have as many friends as possible within the country and abroad and as few enemies as possible. That is the point of our policy."

It would seem clear that the Afghan authorities are ready to establish and develop, without delay, friendly relations with their Islamic neighbors--Iran and Pakistan. What then is the noise about? After all, it is not Afghanistan which is interfering in the affairs of other states. In fact there is blatant interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs and new attempts are being made to unite all reactionary circles in the region and to prevent the Afghan people from building a new life.

CORRESPONDENTS ATTEST TO AFGHAN GOVERNMENT SUPPORT FOR ISLAM

NC031414 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 3 Feb 80 NC

[Seyful-Mulyukov and Bazilevich report from Kabul: "False Defenders of Afghan Muslims"]

[Excerpt] First, please lesten to some points. One-tenth of the Afghans make pilgrimages to Mecca and other holy places. We have seen with our own eyes Afghan pilgrims going on these religious trips by plane and bus.

The teaching of the Islamic faith and discussions of relevant matters are compulsory in all public schools in Afghanistan. At Kabul University there is no active theology department. As during the days before the April revolution, now also all mosques and religious schools in Afghanistan are once again [word indistinct] and all religious holidays are observed. For intance, the birthday of his holiness Mohammad, the Messenger of Islam, on 29 January, was a public holiday as in other Islamic countries, and many Afghans watched Babrak Karmal and other Afghan leaders on television as they worshiped and prayed in the mosque.

The question is asked: The participants in the Islamic Conference spoke of which Islamic freedom in present Afghanistan, and the groups of armed mercenaries fight for the sake of which freedom? A while ago in Kunar Province on the Afghan-Pakistan border, an American rifle was confiscated from a captive mercenary and a pamphlet of the so-called Islamic Party of Afghanistan was taken which had been published in great numbers in Pakistan, financed by the United States and China. Pictures of mercenaries armed with U.S. and Chinese weapons can be seen in the pamphlet. They hide neither their foreign weapons nor their visible aims, which are burning, killing and sabotage activities against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the people, and their freedom and peaceful existence. All these acts take place under the flag of defense of Islam. In Washington and Beijing they have appointed such a duty for the mercenaries. In respect to these facts, speeches by some participants at the Islamic Conference that the so-called defenders of Islam are occupied in just battles in the cause of deliverance of Afghan Muslims with U.S. and Chinese weapons from Pakistani bases were not at all satisfactory.

DOBROV EXPLAINS SOVIET ACTION IN AFGHANISTANT AS 'REPELLING AGGRESSION'

LD040016 Moscow in Italian to Italy 2100 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

[Text] The events in and around Afghanistan have attracted great attention everywhere. The interest in these events is reflected in the letters from our listeners. Most of these letters express their authors' desire to understand the substance of these events. This is all the more so since the events in Afghanistan have been surrounded by such a dense propaganda fog that it is difficult to understand--and for many even impossible to understand--how things really stand. Our observer, Mikhail Dobrov, answers some of these questions from listeners.

The first question concerns Amin. He is presented in the West as the legitimate president of Afghanistan who was allegedly deposed and illegally executed. Let us begin with the fact, writes the observer, that Hafizollah Amin usurped power. He did so by killing Nur Mohammed Taraki, the leader of the April revolution and founder of Democratic Afghanistan, its first legitimate president. The murder was atrocious. We have in this connection the eyewitness reports of the material executors of Amin's orders.

Consequently, it is useless to speak of the legitimacy of Amin's presidency. The popularity of Taraki in the country was so great that opposition to Amin formed immediately. It grew spontaneously, while the usurper was amplifying his actions and establishing a regime of bloody terror.

It was Babrak Karmal who placed himself at the head of the opposition. He was formerly Taraki's substitute, who, thanks to Amin's intrigues, was sent out of the country on a diplomatic mission. Immediately after the coup d'etat staged by Amin, Babrak Karmal secretly returned to Afghanistan. He met members of the Revolutionary Council, obtaining the support of a majority of them.

Once he was isolated, Amin was overthrown. He was brought for judgment before the Revolutionary Council and the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan. He was sentenced to death and executed because of his bloody deeds against his fellow-citizens and for high treason, and because, according to what has been ascertained, he collaborated with the U.S. CIA, which recruited him when he was studying in America.

In this connection, it was believed in the CIA that the Hafizollah Amin regime, bearing its internal evolution in mind, was fully consonant with the long-term interests of the United States.

Let us now discuss these interests. The fact is that some listeners, in particular Massimo di Blasio and Angela Meloni, believe that the threat posed by imperialism to Afghanistan is a myth. Consequently the introduction of Soviet troops into Afghanistan arouses profound anxiety in them.

The fact that the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan, to say the least, did not arouse a feeling of satisfaction in Washington and various other Western capitals does not particularly need to be demonstrated, the observer replies, but not everyone is aware that immediately afterwards an undeclared was was launched against Democratic Afghanistan. It intensified particularly after the fall of the shah's regime in Iran and the loss by the Americans of their positions in that country--particularly the military positions.

The eyes of the American strategists turned to Afghanistan as a possible position for actions aimed at either the Soviet Union or revolutionary Iran. Wars and aggressions can be of different kinds. In the document approved by the UN General Assembly, the definition of an act of aggression also includes the dispatch by a state or on behalf of a state of armed bands and groups, irregular or mercenary forces, who use armed force against another state.

Such actions were in fact initiated against Democratic Afghanistan from Pakistani territory. Even in the reports of Western journalists, one can find statements that were made in the bases in Pakistan where groups of saboteurs and terrorists are being trained for the invasion of Afghanistan. Who is training them? American and Chinese instructors. What weapons do they use? Principally American but also Chinese weapons.

These bands are in active operation. As early as late October last year armed operations were conducted in 12 out of the 28 provinces of Afghanistan. The country's government, even in Taraki's time, asked the Soviet Union for help. The Soviet Union abstained, hoping that the invaders would not overstep certain limits.

However, toward the end of last year external armed interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan had reached such proportions and forms as to threaten the very existence of the republic. The Soviet Union was unable to refuse help given the conditions that had been created. As a matter of fact, the USSR and Afghanistan are old and good neighbors.

In addition, between the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan there is a treaty of friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation. Article 4 of this treaty directly provides for the adoption, with the consent of the two parties, of respective measures designed to guarantee the security, independence and territorial integrity of both countries. The help given by the USSR also corresponds with the UN Charter which provides for the right of individual and collective defense in order to repel aggression and restore peace. It is precisely the restoration of peace and defense from external aggression that are involved in Afghanistan. The sole task of the Soviet military contingent is to help the Afghans to repel the aggression from outside.

Certain letters ask the question: When will the Soviet troops leave Afghanistan? The observer replies that they will be completely withdrawn as soon as the causes that induced the Afghan leadership to ask them to come no longer exist. Unfortunately, the situation around Afghanistan continues to escalate in spite of the process of the normalization of live in Afghanistan itself.

As we know, President Carter has announced that urgent military aid worth $400 million will be sent to Pakistan. Now, there is talk of aid worth $1 billion. According to newspaper reports, it appears that from the Pakistani port of Karchi columns of trucks loaded with arms and explosives are moving toward the Pakistani-Afghan border. They are moving toward the bases in which the terrorist bands are trained.

According to admissions made by saboteurs captured in Afghanistan, there exists a plan for the invasion of Afghanistan from three directions. Consequently, the threat of an intensification of the undeclared war against Afghanistan is growing. This is a war which is being stoked up in the immediate neighborhood of the USSR and which is being fostered by the United States, which is located 15,000 miles away from this region. We repeat, in spite of the worsening of tension around Afghanistan, the situation in the country itself is returning to normal.

The members of a French trade union delegation that visited Afghanistan reported during a press conference in Paris that the situation in Kabul is totally unlike the distorted picture given in the West. Offices and businesses are working normally. Cinemas and shops are open. Afghans willingly spoke with the members of the delegation. Practically no Soviet soldiers are to be seen in the city. With regard to Soviet units, they are taking part in the defense of lines of communications, bridges and roads. As a result, on many roads where a few weeks ago it was impossible to travel, traffic now runs unhindered. The number of bandit attacks has dropped appreciably.

The number of attacks has dropped but there are still attacks. This is demonstrated by reports coming in from Afghanistan. Furthermore, the bandits operate abjectly, bestially. A PRENSA LATINA correspondent visited inhabited localities attacked by terrorists infiltrating into Afghanistan. On the wall of a ruined school the journalist saw a inscription left by the bandits: Death To All Who Can Read and Write--such are the advocates of freedom and the defenders of Islam.

In Kabul, on a wall in the entrance hall of the Ministry of Agriculture there is a fresco depicting the redistribution of land under the agrarian reform law approved in Taraki's time. In the forefront of the fresco two rich landowners are shedding bitter tears, while a huge crowd of peasants is lining up to receive allotments.

If we want to speak concretely, one of those deprived of land and privileges after the revolution is Sayyed Ahmed Ghilani. At present, he heads an organization of Afghan counterrevolutionaries that has sought refuge in Pakistan. We can understand that for Sayyed Ahmed Ghilani the concept of freedom consists of a return to the old order in Afghanistan. He even wants the monarchy to return and restore the shops and properties that formerly belonged to him. While instead, the peasants who received the lands confiscated from Ghilani and other great landowners would like them to remain their property.

Thus it is not Islam that is involved in Afghanistan, nor popular customs and traditions--all these are preserved by the new power. The alternative is this--either Afghanistan will follow the road that leads to the good of the overwhelming majority or Ghilani an his equivalents will return.

The Afghan people would of course easily be able to overcome Ghilani and his company. It was not for nothing that these hastened to seek refuge abroad. But they are being helped with weapons and money by the imperialists, especially those in the United States.

The Afghan revolution and the people of Afghanistan, still have many problems, of course, observer Mikhail Dobrov writes in conclusion, including poverty and illiteracy--in fact 90 percent of all Afghans were illiterate. They also have to fight external aggression. Amin brought havoc to certain circles with his nefarious acts while claiming to be a communist, but the people of Afghanistan are regaining their certainty, and this certainty is being infused with the actions of the new government. That is why confidence in it is growing.

Speaking of the sense of the policy of his government, Babrak Karmal declared: We want to have the greatest possible number of friends inside the country and abroad and the smallest possible number of enemies.

AFGHAN REFUGEES DESCRIBED AS 'MOST BITTER ENEMIES' OF COUNTRY

LD011546 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] The so-called special session of the Islamic Conference Organization, held in Islamabad a few days back, showed that Washington managed, with the assistance of certain rightwing regimes dependent on it, to foist on the Muslim countries an anti-Soviet and anti-Afghan stance. The resolution adopted by the session in connection with the events in Afghanistan contains, in particular, an appeal to give support to the Afghan refugees in every possible way. Who then are these Afghan refugees to whom it is planned to give aid--aid that is already being given both in the form of money and arms? Counterrevolutionaries, the most bitter enemies of Democratic Afghanistan, are hiding behind the mask of refugees. The fact that the so-called refugees do not represent the working Afghan people is admitted even by the Western bourgeois press. A correspondent of the American paper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, who spent some time in a Pakistani border area, talked about one of them. This was a former landowner who owned a thousand acres of orchards and fields. The peasants who worked for him received only meagre pay in return.

The Afghan revolution deprived him of the opportunity of exploiting poor peasants. The main body of the notorious refugees consists of such rich people as himself--money lenders, merchants and representatives of the reactionary leadership of the clergy. In a conversation with the American correspondent they revealed their true reactionary nature by stating their opposition to the just redistribution of land and the setting up of schools for girls. Washington, Beijing and their assistants are urging people to help this counterrevolutionary emigrant rabble in the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The West and China are trying in this to exploit the territory of Pakistan which has granted refuge to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries as a springboard for anti-Afghan activities and for spreading their influence over the countries in the area. But banking on the counterrevolution is scarcely justified. The Afghan people has thrown the counterrevolutionary rabble out of the country and is vigilantly standing guard over its revolutionary gains.

AFGHAN OLYMPIC COMMITTEE SENDS PROTEST LETTER TO CARTER

LD011648 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, February 1, TASS--The attempts by the leaders of some countries and first of all the United States to interfere in matters related to the holding of the 1980 summer Olympic games in Moscow cardinally contradict the very spirit and principles of the Olympic movement. They cardinally contradict the principles of friendship, cooperation and peaceful coexistence of states of the whole world. This is said in a letter sent by the National Olympic Committee of Afghanistan to President Carter of the United States. The text of the letter was circulated by BAKHTAR AGENCY. It says that the National Olympic Committee of the DRA, all sports organizations of the country demand that the U.S. President stop interfering in the affairs of the DRA and stop his attempts to impede the holding of the Olympic games in Moscow

1980 TRADE PROTOCOL SIGNED IN MOSCOW BETWEEN USSR, AFGHANISTAN

LD011708 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, February 1, TASS--A protocol on trade turnover between the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for 1980 was signed here today as a result of successfully concluded talks that passed in an atmosphere of friendship, comradely mutual understanding and business cooperation.

The protocol provides for a growth of mutual deliveries of goods between the two countries by 70 percent as compared to the previous year.

The Soviet Union will export to the DRA machinery and equipment, oil products, ferrous metals, cement, fertilisers, motor vehicles, household, recreational and other goods.

The DRA will export to the USSR natural gas, cotton, carbamide, wool, hides, fresh and dried fruits, nuts, carpets and other goods.

REPORTAGE ON BRZEZINSKI, CHRISTOPHER VISIT TO PAKISTAN

Brzezinski, Christopher Arrival

LD021435 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] President Carter's national security adviser, Brzezinski, and deputy secretary of state, Christopher, have arrived in Pakistan for talks on military aid to that country.

Their trip is being made in the framework of practical implementation of the United States on doctrine on the use of military power for protecting American interests in Europe, in the Middle and Near East and east Asia. According to new agencies, Brzezinski and Christopher intend to offer the Pakistani leaders $400 million worth of weaponry. Pakistan, however, considers that this is insufficient and wants to a considerable increase in military aid, which is being used for training terrorist gangs and infiltrating them into Afghanistan. Tomorrow Brzezinski is to visit one of the centers where terrorists are trained.

Start of Negotiations

LD022224 Moscow TASS in English 2154 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Islamabad, February 2, TASS--Negotiations have opened here between the U.S. President's Assistant for National Security Affairs Z. Brzezinski, Deputy U.S. Secretary of State W. Christopher and President of Pakistan General Ziaul Haq.

The high-placed American emissaries, who came to Islamabad to demonstrate long-term strategic interests of the United States in that region, intend to discuss with Ziaul Haq the contribution which the Pakistani Army and Pakistan itself can make to realization of Washington's militaristic plans. The trip is undertaken in accordance with Carter's idea of establishing the so-called bounds of regional security in South Asia, Middle and Near East.

Discussed in detail at the negotiations will be the question of American military deliveries to Islamabad and this gives rise to serious anxiety on the part of Pakistan's neighbours, India above all, which regards this as a direct threat to its national interests and its security.

Brzezinski and Christopher during their stay in Pakistan are also going to visit areas, neighbouring on Afghanistan, to familiarise themselves with the training of Afghan mercenaries in camps formed on the territory of Pakistan.

New York, February 2, TASS--As is reported by the newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, apart from American arms and military equipment, the present deliveries in Pakistan will also include 300 taks from the FRG, radars and night vision instruments from Britain, firearms and war planes from China. In the opinion of specialists, the newspaper stresses, deliveries of up-to-date equipment will require the dispatch to Pakistan of Western military advisers and military technicians.

Delhi, February 2, TASS--During the debate on the situation in South Asia, which was held at the House of the People of India's Parliament, Foreign Minister of India Narasimha Rao reaffirmed once again that the armament of Pakistan and formation of a military Washington-Beijing-Islamabad alliance is fraught with very serious consequences for India's security.

Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi has emphasized that India keeps a watchful eye over the buildup of the military potential in the Indian Ocean and in some countries of the region, the concentration of a huge naval armada in the Arabian Sea.

The expansion of militarist activity of the United States and China in South Asia is the cause of India's grave concern and anxiety, writes the newspaper NEW AGE. Sending arms to Pakistan, Washington and Beijing create a direct threat to India's independence and security. The United States intends to consolidate its military presence in Pakistan in line with the global strategy of the United States which has full support of Beijing.

Arms Promises to Haq

LD040307 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

[Text] The American-Pakistani talks in Islamabad have confirmed that the United States wants Pakistan to be the country who is assigned the task of implementing U.S. aggressive plans in the region. At a news conference following his talks with President Ziaul Haq, National Security Adviser Brzezinski promised several million dollars worth of military aid to Pakistan. The arms shipments are intended to be used to train and equip the Afghan terrorists. Mr Brzezinski visited one of the bases of the terrorists on Sunday.

KOSYGIN, GANDHI EXCHANGE TELEGRAMS NOTING COOPERATION

Kosygin Message

LD011752 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, February 1, TASS--Aleksey Kosygin has sent the following telegramme to Indira Gandhi:

"Esteemed Madame Prime Minister,

On behalf of the people of the USSR I send you and in your person to the people and government of friendly India congratulations and wishes of further successes on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet-Indian economic and scientific-technical cooperation.

On February 2, 1955, our countries concluded their first inter-governmental agreement--on the construction of the metallurgical plant in Bhilai with the economic and technical assistance of the USSR. This laid the beginning of the cooperation which at present encompasses, in effect, all the most important fields of the life of our countries and is based on a long-term programme.

Today there are more than 70 industrial and other important projects on Indian soil that have been built or are being built by the joint efforts of our countries and play an important role in India's national economy. We are working jointly also in such advanced fields as space research, studies of the structure of the atmosphere and seismic sounding.

Successfully developing as they are on the basis of the treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation, Soviet-Indian relations convincingly show what multifaceted and fruitful ties can unite states with different social systems if their policy is inspired by ideals of peace and the security of peoples, by a common interest in resisting forces of aggression and war, if relations between them are based on principles of mutual respect, sovereign equality and non-interference in internal affairs.

Your meetings, Madame Prime Minister, with L.I. Brezhnev were of determining importance for the strengthening of Soviet-Indian friendship and cooperation.

The Soviet people rejoices at the successes of the Indian people in its struggle for economic and social progress. We are deeply satisfied that following the behests of the great Lenin Soviet people are making their contribution to the efforts of the friendly Indian people directed at strengthening the country's economic independence on the basis of industrialisation and scientific-technical progress.

The steel of Bhilai and Bokaro, the oil of Anklesvar, the modern machines of Ranchi, Durgapur and Hardwar, the electricity of Neiveli and Bhakra have become symbols of the unselfish friendship and fruitgul cooperation of our two great peoples.

We are deeply convinced that the further development of multifacted relations between the USSR and India will enhance the progress and welfare of the peoples of the two countries, will serve the interests of peace in Asia and in the whole world.

Respectfully yours,

[Signed] Aleksey Kosygin".

Gandhi Message

LD011750 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Excerpts] Moscow, February 1, TASS--The Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Aleksey Kosygin and the Prime Minister of India Indira Gandhi exchanged telegrammes of congratulations on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet-Indian economic and scientific-technical cooperation.

Indian-Soviet economic cooperation has attained such a development that today it encompasses a broad spectrum of India's industrial and economic life, says the telegramme from Indira Gandhi. More than 70 joint Indian-Soviet projects are vivid evidence of cooperation between the two countries. We especially value the Soviet Union's important contribution to India's efforts to create a developed industrial infrastructure, Indira Gandhi stressed.

On the occasion of the 25th anniversary of Soviet-Indian economic and scientific-technical cooperation messages of congratulations were exchanged by the chairmen of the Soviet and Indian parts of the inter-governmental Soviet-Indian Commission on Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation Ivan Arkhipov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Narashimha Rao, minister of foreign affairs of India.

INDIAN PRESIDENT ISSUES NEW GOVERNMENT'S PROGRAM

LD011301 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Vladimir Shirokov "Commentator's Column": "Following the Traditional Course"]

[Text] Delhi--Indian President Neelam Sanjiva Reddy delivered a speech at a joint session of both chambers of Parliament setting out the new Indian Government's program. Apart from questions of the domestic situation, substantial space in the speech was devoted to international problems and the country's foreign policy. "In international affairs," the president stated, "the government will follow a course of nonalinement." This is India's traditional course and has stood the test of time. It originated with Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister, who laid the foundations of the country's foreign policy. The government program proclaims: India intends to continue to maintain and strengthen friendly relations with all countries on the basis of equality and sovereignty, mutual respect and noninterference in other states' internal affairs. India puts forward the course of friendship and cooperation as a counterweight to U.S. imperialism, which is trying to set the peoples of southwest Asia and the South Asian subcontinent on a path of confrontation.

The president's speech expressed concern in connection with the fuss which has been created around events in Afghanistan. [paragraph continues]

India clearly expressed its position on this question in the speech of its official representative at the United Nations, where it refused to support the anti-Soviet resolution inspired by the United States and other enemies of the Afghan revolution. India intends to strengthen good-neighborly relations with Pakistan on the basis of the agreement reached in Simla in 1972 and declares its readiness, despite the existence of a number of problems, including border problems, to normalize relations with the PRC. This is a fitting answer to attempts by Washington and Beijing to exacerbate the situation on India's borders with Pakistan and China. A special place is occupied in India's foreign policy by the traditional friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. "The Soviet Union," Prime Minister Indira Gandhi stated in Delhi the other day, "is India's true friend. It has helped us in our economic development and supported our position on many important international problems." Indira Gandhi expressed the conviction that friendly relations between our countries, reinforced by the 1971 treaty on peace, friendship and cooperation, are a valuable contribution to the defense of peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world.

The years of India's independence have proved convincingly that its policy of nonalinement serves the cause of peace and mutually advantageous cooperation. This policy has brought India well-earned international prestige.

BULANTSEV COMMENTS ON 'FAILURE' OF CLIFFORD'S MISSION TO INDIA

LD012016 Moscow TASS in English 1805 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, February 1, TASS--TASS commentator Sergey Bulantsev writes: When leaving on a working visit for Delhi the assistant of the U.S. President Clark Clifford took with him a whole set of phrases that he intended to offer the Indian leaders as calmative pills in order to convince them that Washington's intention to grant Islamabad military aid to the sum of 400 million dollars does not threaten India's security. In his attempts to prove the obviously unprovable the American envoy talked at length about the "Soviet threat" that allegedly overhangs Pakistan and very soon will move on to India. The U.S. presidential assistant impertinently tried to assure Indian officials that the militarisation of Pakistan, planned by the U.S. administration, pursues the sole aim of strengthening its defence potential but could not demonstrate with any degree of persuasiveness who was threatening Pakistan and why was it so necessary for Islamabad to buildup its military machine. Clifford clumsily tried to prove that American arms deliveries to Pakistan "are in the interests of peace." Following this strange logic, to say the least, of the American envoy one can go as far as the absurd statement that disarmament inevitably leads to armed conflicts:

Clifford could not resist also the temptation to scare people with weak nerves with the notorious "Soviet military threat", this time to the Persian Gulf. If the Soviet Union sends its troops into the Persian Gulf, the American envoy prophesised at a press conference, "that means war." As to the American troops that already are engaged in sabre-rattling in the Persian Gulf area and are threatening "military sanctions" against Iran and other countries situated thousands of miles away from U.S. borders, they--to follow Clifford's logic--are apparently entrusted with purely peace-making functions. Are not these functions akin to the bloody "pacification" by the American military which has been experienced, in particular by the peoples of Indo-China? The failure of Clifford's mission showed that the plans of militarising Pakistan are viewed in India as a serious threat to national security, as an undermining of efforts to normalise the situation in southern Asia. The question arises: Do the people in Islamabad think about the entire danger of the military-political game in which it is intended to make Pakistan a pawn. And do they remember that pawns are the first to be sacrificed?

REPORTAGE ON HENG SAMRIN'S VISIT TO USSR

Arrival in Tbilisi

LD030453 Moscow TASS in English 0442 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

["For an Official Friendly Visit"--TASS headline]

[Text] Tbilisi, February 3, TASS--A delegation of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea and the National Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea came for an official freindly visit today to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR. The delegation is led by Chairman of the Central Committee of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea, Chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea Heng Samrin. On their way to Moscow the delegation made a stop-over in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, a Soviet transcaucasian republic.

The guests were welcomed by alternate member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia Eduard Shevardnadze, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic Pavel Gilashvili, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Georgia Zarub Pataridze, other officials.

Kampuchea's ambassador to the USSR Keo Prasat was among the welcoming party.

Shevardnadze Dinner

LD032002 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

[Text] A delegation of the Kampuchean United Front of National Salvation and the People's Revolutionary Council arrived in the Soviet Union today. It is headed by Heng Samrin, chairman of the United Front Central Committee and chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea. En route to Moscow, the delegation made a stopover in Tbilisi where a meeting took place between the members of the delegation from People's Kampuchea and leaders of the Georgian SSR. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, warmly welcomed the guests on their first visit to the Soviet Union and described the development of the republic's economy and culture to them.

The Georgian leaders have a dinner in honor of the Kampuchean guests during which Shevardnadze and Samrin exchanged firendly toasts.

Brezhnev Meets at Airport

LD040819 Moscow TASS in English 0815 GMT 4 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, February 4, TASS--A delegation of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea and the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea has come to Moscow for an official friendly visit today at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government. The delegation is led by Chairman of the Central Committee of the National United Front for the Salvation of Kampuchea, Chairman of the People's Revolutionary Council of Kampuchea Heng Samrin.

At the airport the delegation was met by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Leonid Brezhnev, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Foreign Minister of the USSR Andrey Gromyko, Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR Nikolay Tikhonov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Defence Minister of the USSR Marshal Dmitriy Ustinov, other officials.

PHOUMI VONGVICHIT INTERVIEWED ON AFGHANISTAN, PRC

OW021251 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1230 GMT 1 Feb 80 OW

[Report on station reporter's interview with Phoumi Vongvichit, member of the Political Bureau of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee and vice premier of the Lao People's Democratic Republic--date, place not given]

[Text] The first question asked of Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit by this reporter was: What do you think of the aid the Soviet Union gives to countries struggling for national independence?

Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit said: The Soviet Union is the first socialist country in the world. Its domestic policy is to seek overall progress and prosperity for its people as a whole. The Soviet Union's foreign policy is based on the Marxist-Leninist principle of maintaining peace and strengthening friendship and mutual understanding with the people in all other countries. The Soviet Union is faithful to its internationalist duty and implements this political line. It has always offered selfless aid to countries struggling for national independence and to the forces humanitarianism and justice throughout the world. The Lao people's history and their struggle for liberating themselves are brilliant examples of using this selfless aid. Thanks to the Soviet Union's tremendous material assistance and political support, the people of our country are achieving true independence.

Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit continued: During the years of struggle against imperialism for national independence and during the present period of socialist reform, our country has always received the Soviet Union's aid and support. In the economic and cultural spheres the Soviet Union has been considering our needs and extending us overall assistance. It has supplied us with needed equipment and materials. Soviet experts have helped us in economic construction.

[Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit was asked] Imperialism and Beijing propaganda have raised a hullabaloo on the Afghanistan event to slander the Soviet Union, Comrade Vongvichit, what do you think of the Soviet stand on this issue?

He said: The Soviet Union gave aid at the request of the Afghan Government to obstruct the imperialists' and expansionists' interference from outside. The timely fraternal aid given by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries protects the Afghan people's independence and prosperity. I believe that under the leadership of the Afghan People's Democratic Party headed by Karmal, the closely united Afghan people will march forward along the road of realizing their own long-cherished national aspirations.

Asked about the situation in the Lao-Chinese border area, Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit pointed out: The situation in the border area is very tense. China has amassed a force of several divisions along the border and is using every means to aggravate the situation in the area. He emphasized: We demand that the Chinese troops be withdrawn from the border area.

Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit said: We have always believed that the Lao and Chinese people are friends and that a good-neighborly relationship can be developed between them. All border issues can be solved through negotiations; this conforms with the long-cherished aspirations of the people of both countries and can help strengthen peace and friendship.

Comrade Phoumi Vongvichit concluded: To consolidate peace in this region, we will develop cooperation with the Southeast Asian countries.

BREZHNEV, KOSYGIN SEND GREETINGS TO VIETNAMESE LEADERS

LD011335 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 80 p 1 LD

[Text] To Comrade Ton Duc Thang, president of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam [SRV], Comrade Le Duan, general secretary of the Vietnam Communist Party [VCP] Central Committee, Comrade Truong Chinh, chairman of the SRV National Assembly Standing Committee, Comrade Pham Van Dong, prime minister of the SRV.

Dear Comrades:

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, all Soviet people and ourselves personally, we send you and, through you, the VCP Central Committee, the National Assembly Standing Committee, the SRV Government, and the fraternal Vietnamese people cordial greetings on the 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

The establishment of relations between our countries was a notable milestone in the history of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship which originates from the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and it laid the foundation to the broad equitable cooperation between our states and peoples. Soviet-Vietnamese relations are based on a firm foundation--Marxist-Leninist ideology, the commonality of goals, and the unvarying loyalty of our countries to the principles of socialist internationalism. The indestructible alliance of the communist parties of the Soviet Union and Vietnam is a life-giving force guiding and organizaing the process of the consistent consolidation of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship.

The past 30 years have been marked by the unswerving intensification and development of comradely solidarity and fruitful collaboration between our parties, countries and peoples. Unshakable Soviet-Vietnamese cohesion has proved its great vital force and effectiveness in thepeaceful creative labor of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Vietnam and in the joint struggle against forces of imperialism, colonialism and reaction. Soviet people are proud that they were with their Vietnamese brothers in their heroic victorious struggle against U.S. imperialist aggression and rendered all-round support and aid to Vietnam's just cause.

The present stage of Soviet-Vietnamese relations is characterized by their further enrichment and improvement. The friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and the SRV concluded in November 1978 raised to a qualitatively new level the whole complex of diverse Soviet-Vietnamese ties and reinforced mutual aid and collaboration between our countries in resolving tasks of socialist and communist building and of maintaining peace in Asia and throughout the world. The treaty, which fully confirmed its effectiveness during the Vietnamese people's repulsion of Beijing's armed aggression in February-March 1979, reliably serves the interests of socialism, the task of actively opposing the intrigues of the forces of great-power hegemonism and imperialism.

Loyal to their international duty and the spirit and letter of the treaty, Soviet people will continue tirelessly to strengthen the traditional Soviet-Vietnamese friendship and fraternity and firmly stand on the side of the Vietnamese people in their efforts to build a new life and in defending Vietnam's independence and sovereignty.

We wish the Vietnamese people, under the leadership of their tested vanguard--the VCP--new attainments in the all-round consolidation and progress of the Vietnamese state--the reliable outpost of peace and socialism in Southeast Asia.

[Signed] L. Brezhnev, A. Kosygin.

MASHEROV-LED DELEGATION VISITS HANOI COMMITTEE

LD301228 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 30 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The Vietnamese people are warmly welcoming the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation which is in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam on an official visit. Today, the delegation, headed by Masherov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian Communist Party, visited the People's Committee in Hanoi. A friendly conversation took place with representatives of party, administrative and economic organs and social organizations of the Vietnamese capital. The same day, the delegation visited the Hanoi machine-tool building works No one, a product of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship.

MASHEROV ADDRESSES USSR-SRV FRIENDSHIP MEETING

LD312310 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1946 GMT 31 Jan 80 LD

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Hanoi:

A Vietnamese-Soviet friendship meeting involving many thousands of people was held today in the city of Hue, the center of Binh Tri Thien Province. The residents gave a warm welcome to the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Masherov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, which is paying an official visit to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

Addressing the meeting, (Vu Thang) deputy secretary of the party committee in the province, deputy chairman of the provincial people's committee and chairman of the local branch of the Vietnamese-Soviet Friendship Society, stated that the Vietnamese people will never forget the enormous help provided by the fraternal Soviet people in Vietnam's struggle for national liberation and the building of socialism.

Addressing the meeting, Comrade Masherov conveyed to the Vietnamese people fraternal greetings from Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium of the USSR, and from the whole Soviet people.

Our people are currently demonstrating wholeheartedly their unshakable loyalty to their international duty as they celebrate that significant date in the history of our countries--the 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Vietnam, Comrade Masherov said. An extremely important part is played in the deepening and development of the comradely solidarity and beneficial collaboration of our parties, countries and peoples by the regular meetings between Comrades Brezhnev and Le Duan and between other leaders of the Soviet Union and Vietnam.

One natural and highly logical result of the progressive development of Soviet-Vietnamese relations in an upward direction was the conclusion of the friendship and cooperation treaty between the USSR and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in November 1978. Having raised the entire complex of multifaceted Soviet-Vietnamese links to a qualitatively new level, the treaty fully demonstrated its effectiveness during last year's treacherous attack by China on the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and became a reliable weapon in the hands of our people to foil Beijing's aggressive plans.

Over the few days we have stayed on Vietnamese soil we have clearly sensed the fast pace of the selfless labor of the people and their resolve and will to defend their sacred national rights and to protect the honor and independence of their homeland. We are confident that the courageous and hardworking Vietnamese people, led by their glorious Communist Party, will successfully overcome the difficulties facing them and will build a powerful, independent, flourishing socialist state.

As far as Soviet people are concerned, they will continue to tirelessly strengthen the ties of brotherhood with heroic Vietnam and stand firmly on the side of Vietnam's just cause, Comrade Masherov said in conclusion.

The meeting was a clear demonstration of Vietnamese-Soviet friendship.

SRV'S NGUYEN CO THACH INTERVIEWED ON USSR RELATIONS

OW300525 Moscow in Vietnamese to Vietnam 1300 GMT 29 Jan 80 OW

[Text] Dear friends: On the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Vietnam, our Hanoi-based correspondent recently interviewed Comrade Nguyen Co Thach, SRV secretary of state and assistant to the SRV premier on foreign affairs. The following are Comrade Nguyen Co Thach's responses during the interview.

[Begin recording] This event is of momentous significance because it marks a new development in the longstanding relations between the Vietnamese and Soviet revolutions; it marks the close relationship between the revolutionary struggle of the Vietnamese people and the Great October Revolution; it marks the close relationship between the success of the August 1945 revolution that led to the establishment of the DRV and the Soviet people's victories in their great patriotic wars against the German Fascists and Japanese militarists; it marks the close relationship between the war of resistance waged by the Vietnamese against the French at that time and the emergence of the international socialist system headed by the Soviet Union. This event is of utmost importance to the Vietnamese people because for the first time after a century of French domination Vietnam was recognized by the world's peoples. It is also extremely important because this marks the recognition of the first state of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Vietnamese people's history, of the first worker-peasant state which had regained independence from colonialists, of the first worker-peasant state in Southeast Asia.

The Soviet Union's recognition of Vietnam at that time was of very great importance to the Vietnamese people who were waging a war of resistance. As we know, toward the end of 1949 the U.S. imperialists attempted to interfere in and expand the Indochina war and to encircle the Vietnamese people's revolution and those of the other Indochinese peoples. This recognition opened up a new period of worldwide support for the Vietnamese people and thwarted the French and U.S. imperialists' scheme of encircling and isolating the Vietnamese people.

Events over the past 30 years have testified to the important significance of the Soviet Union's recognition of Vietnam. Over the past 30 years, we have had to wage the longest, most arduous struggle in contemporary history. We have had to repeatedly fight various enemies--the French imperialists, the U.S. imperialists and then the Beijing expansionists whose might far exeeds that of Vietnam. They are dangerous enemies, especially the U.S. imperialists and the Beijing expansionists, who are the most dangerous enemies of the world's peoples.

Vietnam is a small country with a small population and a backward, impoverished economy. However, we have defeated various enemies and scored very glorious historic victories of epochal significance. These victories were made possible because the Vietnamese people have remained united in their struggle under the VCP's leadership and because they have received the support of other socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union. Without the assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the world's peoples struggling for independence cannot defeat their very dangerous enemies.

Another very important fact is that over the past 30 years, although African, Asian and Latin American countries have regained their political independence, they continue to be mercilessly exploited by and remain dependent on imperialism. Consequently, they cannot be independent economically, their economies cannot be prosperous and Third World countries are becoming increasingly poorer. The Vietnamese people are building socialism and an independent economy in such a world situation. Thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, Vietnam, a backward, impoverished country, is able to advance directly toward socialism, by passing the path of capitalist development.

We have noticed that the Beijing clique and the U.S. imperialists over past years have sought to strangle Vietnam's economy. Without the assistance of the Soviet Union, we would have been greatly hampered in our struggle. We also realize that the imperialists and the reactionaries no longer can use economic influence as an effective weapon to oppose or control other people because the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are behind them. Our country has joined CEMA, a socialist organization headed by the Soviet Union. This is very important to us.

Historic facts over the past 30 years have proved that the Soviet Union is our trusted friend, a strategic ally very important to our national defense and economic development. The fact is we have signed a friendship and cooperation treaty with the Soviet Union. This treaty has contributed to strengthening solidarity between the Vietnamese and Soviet peoples. It is a factor insuring independence and peace for Vietnam and the rest of Southeast Asia, as well as insuring peace and stability in the area.

We have remained closely united with the Soviet Union. We both share a common ideal: communism and socialism. Our two peoples have also waged a common struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism. Our two peoples have struggled against our common enemies: the imperialists and the Beijing reactionaries. Therefore, in the common struggle, the Vietnamese people fully support the Soviet Union's initiatives for peace, detente and disarmament.

The Vietnamese people and Government highly value the Soviet Union's valuable assistance to the Afghan people, which fully reflects its international proletarian spirit. World realities over the past several decades prove that the Soviet Union is a bulwark for peace and the world revolutions. With this spirit in mind, on behalf of the Vietnamese people and the SRV Government, we sincerely thank the fraternal Soviet people who have wholeheartedly assisted the Vietnamese people in their just struggle. [end recording]

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON GROMYKO VISIT TO ROMANIA

Continuation of Talks

LD011610 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Bucharest, February 1, TASS--Today member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR Andrey Gromyko had his second conversation with the General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, President of the Socialist Republic of Romania Nicolae Ceausescu. The discussion of topical international problems and presentation of the positions of the sides of a number of these problems were continued. Touched upon during the talks were questions connected with the activities of the defence organization of the socialist countries of Europe on the threshold of its anniversary--the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Warsaw Treaty. Nicolae Ceausescu held luncheon in honour of Andrey Gromyko at which they exchanged friendly toasts.

End of Talks, Departure

LD021234 Moscow TASS in English 1228 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Bucharest, February 2, TASS--The talks between member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko and General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, President of the Socialist Republic of Romania Nicolae Ceausescu ended today. At the closing meeting, the sides discussed some international problems of mutual interest and questions of the development of bilateral relations between the Soviet Union and the Socialist Republic of Romania. Present at the talks from the Soviet side were member of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Foreign Minister of the USSR V.F. Maltsev and member of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Ambassador in the Socialist Republic of Romania V.I. Drozdenko. Present from the Romanian side were member of the Political Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, Deputy Prime Minister of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Romania Paul Niculescu and alternate member of the Political Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party, Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Romania Stefan Andrei. On the same day A.A. Gromyko left Bucharest. At the airport he was seen off by Paul Niculescu, member of the Political Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Romanian Communist Party (RCP), deputy prime minister of the Romanian Government, Stefan Andrei, candidate member of the Political Executive Committee of the RCP CC, minister of foreign affairs of Romania, and by other officials. Among the send-off party was V.I. Drozdenko, the ambassador of the USSR to Romania.

Return to Moscow

LD021548 Moscow TASS in English 1538 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, February 2, TASS--Member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko today returned to Moscow from Bucharest. He teld talks with General Secretary of the Romanian Communist Party, President of the Socialist Republic of Romania Nicolae Ceausescu. At the airport in Moscow, Andrey Gromyko was met by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the SPCU Central Committee Andrey Kirilenko and other officials. Ambassador of the Socialist Republic of Romania in the Soviet Union Trajan Dudas was among the welcoming party.

Romanian Coverage

For Romanian reportage on Foreign Minister Gromyko's visit to Romania, see the Romanian section of the 1 February Eastern Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

SCHMIDT STRESSES FRG WILL HONOR ALL AGREEMENTS WITH USSR

LD0220180 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Bonn, February 2, TASS--The FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Schmidt in an interview to the West German television has said: Proceeding from a long-term perspective, I am firmly confident that the USSR is exclusively interested to see to it that peace between the two great power is not broken.

I do not go back by a single word on the joint declaration, signed on May 6, 1978 by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the FRG chancellor, said the head of the West German Government. The Federal Republic of Germany abides by every phrase, every paragraph, every article of any treaty, any agreement we have ever concluded. We should abide by this not only on moral grounds, but also because we are exclusively interested in a similar attitude of the partners to treaties. Our interest is that economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, designed for 25 years, should not be discarded. Everything we have signed and everything we have agreed upon was not, so to say, just a forecast of good weather. We were aware that in the future, particularly over 25 years, weather might spoil. He who would like to discard all the treaties, would make a serious blunder.

A possibility of contacts between the great powers, said Helmut Schmidt, I see, above all, in the sphere of control over armaments. May be, also in the sphere of politics recorded by the all-European conference in Helsinki, which was continued in Belgrade and planned on the agenda of the Madrid meeting, which, I hope, will take place.

Touching upon the military psychosis, being fanned up by some forces in the West, he said: I don't know whether it is correct to spread today "fear of war." But still I consider it wrong. We should not spread fear. There is no ground for it. Fear is a poor adviser, it can lead to incorrect appraisals. Fear may prevent the necessary from being done and it can lead to steps that are outside the framework of reasonable actions.

SOVIET OFFICES BOMBED IN PARIS, BRUSSELS

LD021911 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1739 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Paris, 2 February--An act of banditry has been carried out against the information office of the USSR Embassy in France. Last night a bomb placed by terrorists exploded on the windowsill of the lower story of the building containing the office. By a fortunate circumstance there were no casualties. The building suffered significant damage. Glass was blown out of the windows of nearby houses. Cars parked in front of the building were badly damaged.

The terrorist act committed in Paris was the malevolent result of the slanderous anti-Soviet and anticommunist campaign which has recently been unleashed here by the bourgeois organs of mass information. It shows that in spite of frequent warnings by the Soviet side and demands that they insure the protection of Soviet institutions and put an end to this campaign which has been unleashed, the French authorities are not taking the effective measures which are their duty.

Brussels, 2 February--An explosion was carried out here early this morning at the entrance to the local Aeroflot office by unknown persons. Serious material damage was caused to the building housing the agency. Local authorities have begun investigations.

NORDIC STATES SEEK TO PRESERVE PEACE, AVOID U.S. SCHEMES

LD311151 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Correspondent Yu. Goloshubov article: "Northern Europe: Strengthening the Zone of Peace"]

[Text] Helsinki--People in the countries of northern Europe are following with concern the attempts by certain Western circles, above all in the United States, to direct the development of events along the dangerous path of confrontation. This concern is quite justified and natural.

It is customary to regard northern Europe as the most tranquil and stable region of the European Continent, where peace-loving traditions are strong, as is the desire to protect the region against the dangerous adversities inherent in the NATO and Pentagon course in the world arena. That is why people in northern Europe adopted a very cautious attitude toward recent measures by the U.S. administration directed against the USSR and the policy of detente and filled with the "cold war" spirit. Voices can be heard here calling increasingly loudly for the continuation of the course of the relaxation of international tension and the achievement of real measures in the disarmament sphere an for the continuation of the policy of cooperation, which accords with the interests of all countries and peoples.

This applies above all to Finland, which, as is known, played a notable role in the process of normalizing the European political climate and is striving to follow the path outlined by the Final Act of the all-European conference. This desire has again been expressed clearly in recent speeches by Finnish statesmen and politicians published in the press. Here people in Finland proceed on the basis that it is necessary to strive even more persistently for measures to consolidate peace and security in northern Europe. This idea can be clearly traced in President U.K. Kekkonen's New Year's speech on radio and television on 1 January.

Having assessed the situation in northern Europe positively, the president nevertheless stressed that to insure peace and equilibrium here demands constant efforts by all states in the region. U.K. Kekkonen stated that at present it is particularly important to preserve the situation in which there are no nuclear weapons in northern Europe. The importance of fulfilling this task, in the president's view, is determined by the recent development of events.

Prominent among such events is the decision by the NATO Council session on the production of new American nuclear missile weapons and their deployment in Western Europe. People in Finland are aware that this decision cannot be seen in isolation and effects all Europeans. Apart from the obvious fact that the Pentagon and NATO actions are exacerbating the overall political climate in the European Continent and leading to a new round in the arms race, they could also have unfavorable consequences for north European countries. After all, the recent NATO decisions are spearheaded toward violating the established military-strategic balance of forces in Europe in favor of the West. Such measures inevitably lead to a reaction. Thus NATO's actions will not strengthen European security, as the apologists for a policy of strength assert, but will give rise to even greater anxiety among Europeans. This also applies fully to the Scandinavians.

In Finland serious fears have already been expressed in the face of the development of modern military hardware which could directly affect the security interests of north European countries. This has been repeatedly indicated by President U.K. Kekkonen, for instance. [paragraph continues]

In this connection he has noted in particular the risky nature of cruise missiles, whose use threatens to entail the "involvement in a conflict of states which the conflict does not concern." The press notes that the possible use of cruise missiles, which the United States intends to deploy in West European countries, could violate Finland's air space.

Considerable concern is aroused by this fact in neutral Sweden. I. Thuresson, chairman of a group of Swedish Government experts on disarmament questions, has called for a sober assessment of the situation which has arisen instead of "pulling the wool over the people's eyes by presenting the NATO decision on new missiles as all but a further step toward disarmament."

The American plans scarcely accord with Danish and Norwegian interests. Althoug those countries are NATO members and are obliged, in the opinion of the bloc's ringleaders, to follow in the "general Atlanticist wake," in the course of the preparations for the Brussels session Denmark expressed its reservations with respect to the NATO "arms upgrading" and proposed the postponement of the adoption of the present decisions. Serious disagreements regarding NATO's actions arose in Norway too. Although the two countries were forced to show solidarity with the general NATO position under heavy pressure from Washington, the public in those countries is still opposing the decisions of the Brussels session. That is clear from a Danish public opinion poll, whose results were published in the Copenhagen newspaper BERLINGSKE TIDENDE recently. According to these results, most Danes are critical of the NATO decisions. This is also clear from demonstrations in Norway against the implementation of NATO's plans.

In the conditions which have arisen still greater significance is attached to Denmark's and Norway's traditional policy with respect to the nondeployment of nuclear weapons on Danish and Norwegian soil in peacetime. Consistency in implementing that policy accords with the interests of peace and stability in northern Europe and is of fundamental significance. Norwegian statesmen have repeatedly declared their firm desire to continue to follow this course recently. On the Danish side, the course was again confirmed quite definitely during Danish Foreign Minister K. Olesen's official visit to Finland. Speaking in Helsinki on 7 January, the minister noted that the Danish Government's policy has not changed: Nuclear weapons will not be deployed on Danish territory in present conditions.

This stance is received with satisfaction by broad circles of the Scandinavian public and outside northern Europe. The more so as the Atlanticist strategists, as the facts show, intend to strive even more intensively to involve Norway and Denmark in NATO's militarist preparations. This is indicated by the implementation on Norwegian and Danish territory of various measures aimed at stepping up those countries' "combat readiness" in case it is necessary to rebuff the "Soviet threat."

But the Scandinavians, like other Europeans, know very well that there is not such threat. On the contrary, the Soviet Union invariably continues to demonstrate its firm will for peace and the lessening of the nuclear danger in Europe, as was again confirmed in L.I. Brezhnev's answers to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions. "We are resolute advocates," L.I. Brezhnev said, "of strengthening and augmenting everything positive that has been created on the European Continent over the years by the collective efforts of states--big and small." These words met with a wide response in the northern countries. The public sees them as confirmation that only peaceful, good-neighborly interests dictate the USSR's policy with respect to all Scandinavian countries.

All this, in the opinion of the broad Scandinavian public, creates favorable preconditions for insuring reliable security for north European countries and strengthening the zone of peace in that region. [paragraph continues]

In connection with U.K. Kekkonen's New Year's speech the Finnish newspaper SUOMENMAA writes of the need for even more active work in strengthening the cause of peace and stability in northern Europe. The newspaper stresses that Finland must continue to strive persistently for the implementation of the well-known proposal on turning northern Europe into a nuclear-free zone and granting it the necessary guarantees. As for the Soviet Union, its stance on this question is clear--it has always expressed its readiness to grant such guarantees. The land of the Soviets recently declared again that it will never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce the production and acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territory. The Soviet Union is prepared to draw up appropriate commitments with any interested state--of course, this applies directly to north European countries which oppose the deployment of nuclear weapons on Scandinavian soil and support the creation of long-term and lasting foundations for peace in that region.

COOPERATION WITH WEST COSTLY FOR TURKEY

LD022212 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1830 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Lidiya Suyetina commentary]

[Excerpts] It is well known that organizations such as the IMF and the International Reconstruction and Development Bank, let alone the banks of the United States, West Germany, and other capitalist countries, do not lend money without a good reason. It is impossible not to reach the following conclusion: Turkey's long cooperation with the imperialist countries is costing the country more and more as time goes on. The development of the national economy, the establishment of heavy industry, and raising the Turkish peoples standard of living constitute Turkey's number one problem. But America and the other Western powers, instead of helping the Turkish people solve these important problems, are dragging Turkey towards militarization and greater military expenditures. According to official data, Turkey's 1980 state budget envisages an allocation of 114 billion Turkish liras for military purposes, an increase of 75 percent over the preceding year. The truth remains that Turkey, just as in any other country, has one single state treasury. If more is drawn from it for tanks and aircraft, there will be less money for hospitals, bread and meat.

Everybody knows that an important proportion of the American credits that Turkey wants is being advanced on condition that it is spent for military purposes. CUMHURIYET says that Turkey is tasting the bitter fruits of economic and military dependence on the West, [words indistinct] and reaping the harvest of its membership in NATO that has been such a heavy burden on the Turkish economy. A great many people in and outside Turkey share these painful thoughts of the Turkish paper.

BREZHNEV CONGRATULATES BANI SADR ON ELECTION

LD031743 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 3 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, February 3, TASS--Follows Leonid Brezhnev's telegram to Abolhassan Bani Sadr:

"His Excellency

Mr. Abolhassan Bani Sadr,

President of the Islamic Republic of Iran

Please, accept my congratulations and good wishes upon your election to the high post of president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Soviet people have understanding and sympathy for the struggle of the Iranian people against the continued intrigues of imperialism, for the exercise of their inalienable right to decide as to how they should live their life.

I am sure that relations between the Soviet Union and Iran based on the principles of goodneighbourliness, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs will continue developing to the benefit of the peoples of our countries, in the interests of consolidating peace and international security.

[Signed] Leonid Brezhnev"

STUDENTS' STATEMENT, QOTBZADEH REMARKS REPORTED

LD022058 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, February 2, TASS--Students, who occupy here the U.S. Embassy, have sent a message to Ayatollah Khomeyni, drawing his attention to the "irresponsible and traitorous behaviour of officials unwilling to take any measures against those who were laid bare by the documents discovered at the American Embassy".

The text of the message has been broadcast by the state radio station. The students have stated that when they make public the documents which, in their opinion, show that some people are agents of the United States, "The authorities do not deem it their duty to disclose these hired agents and allow them to continue the traitorous activities". In the letter the students also declared that the people whom they disclose threaten them and opportunist-minded politicians accuse them of departing from the Ayatollah Khomeyni course.

In the students' message to Ayatollah Khomeyni it is reaffirmed once again that they would not release the hostages until the former shah is brought back to Iran.

The Foreign Minister of Iran Sadeq Qotbzadeh denied, according to the PARS NEWS AGENCY, the rumours that are being spread by Western news agencies on some "new routes" of settlement of the Iranian-American conflict. Neither me personally, nor the ministry I am in charge of had any direct or indirect contacts with the Americans, he said, or gave any assurances. The way of settlement of the conflict remains unchanged. This is formation of a commission of investigation of crimes and unlawful activities of the deposed shah, endorsement of the commission is report by the United Nations Organizations, the return of the shah and the property he plundered to Iran. Until the shah is extraited to Iran, the hostages will not be released either together or separately, the minister emphasized.

IRANIAN DECISION TO RAISE OIL PRICES CONFIRMED

LD021552 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, February, TASS--The agency PARS confirmed press reports about Iran's decision to raise the price of Iranian oil from 28.5 to 31 dollars per barrel.

MO'INFAR: IRANIAN OIL PIPELINE SABOTAGED

LD021802 Moscow TASS in English 1657 GMT 2 Feb 80 LD

[Text] Tehran, February 2, TASS--Tehran's Minister of Oil 'Ali Akbar Mo'infar spoke today over the radio about new acts of sabotage. Two powerful explosions were staged at the oil pipeline linking the Iranian town of Ahvaz with the country's biggest oil port Abadan. Special teams managed quickly to localize the fire. The minister stated that these provocative actions will not affect the production and export of Iranian oil.

USTINOV WELCOMES GROMYKO HOME FROM SYRIA

LD011315 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Excerpt] Damascus, 29 January--On the same day A.A. Gromyko returned to Moscow. At the airport he was met by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and other officials.

Jabr al-Kafri, Syrian ambassador to the USSR, was among the welcoming party.

MOSCOW RPP SCORES ATH-THAWRAH CRITICISM OF USSR

LD021019 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic to the Arab World 1630 GMT 30 Jan 80 LD

[Iraqi writer Sa'di Al-Malih commentary]

[Text] The Iraqi ATH-THAWRAH published early this month a series of articles about the so-called recent events in Afghanistan. The articles were replete with malice and fabrications against the Soviet Union, the loyal friend of the Iraqi people, with whom it is linked by a treaty of friendship and cooperation. A quick glance of these articles clearly show the hostility they contain toward the Soviet Union, communism, many progressive Arab states and the revolutions of Iran and Afghanistan. The Iraqi people have been getting a whiff of this for some time. This is not the first time ATH-THAWRAH has carried anti-Soviet and anticommunist articles. This measure supplements the general anti-Soviet and anticommunist campaign which is backed by reactionary quarters.

This is generally related to the dangerous direction taken by those who control the paper after they deviated from the progressive course which had been pursued by Iraq. Signs of this deviation appeared in the past 2 years through the liquidation of many gains of the Iraqi people and the attempts to strike at the patriotic and progressive forces which are hostile to imperialism, Zionism and reaction, in fact at the Iraqi Communist Party.

That is why we see the paper attacking the principled stances of the Soviet Union toward the questions of the Iraqi and Arab peoples, forgetting its sincere aid in all economic, industrial, agricultural and military fields and joining in the furor artifically created by the West about the recent events in Afghanistan.

Here we may ask: On whose side should the Iraqi ATH-THAWRAH have stood? With its friend the Soviet Union or its enemy the imperialist world? The paper this time willy-nilly unmasked itself and openly joined the orchestra of Western propaganda and the imperialist circles which are hostile to the interests of the Iraqi people. Indeed, it went further, for when Western propaganda accused the Soviet Union of interference in the affairs of Afghanistan, ATH-THAWRAH described this interference as blatant and regarded it as occupation. So it alleges. Worse still, it claimed that this incensed the free states. We wonder which are they, these free states?

As is known the disinterested assistance provided by the Soviet Union to Afghanistan could incense only the imperialist, colonialist and Zionist states in the world and reactionaries everywhere. As to the free people in the world, they have stood and still stand on the side of the Afghan people, their revolution and progressive forces. More than once ATH-THAWRAH has reiterated the views of Arab reactionaries and mirrored their attitudes, in particular the views of As-Sadat about the question of Soviet supply of arms to the Arabs and of requirements for development in the Arab countries. It almost quotes from statements by As-Sadat and his ilk. Thus the writers of the articles of ATH-THAWRAH dance to the same American-Israeli tune as is played for As-Sadat, the gendarme of American interests in the region. The series of articles also contained other fabrications and malicious remarks which must be seriously considered. I have no time to talk about them here, but in conclusion I say that casting doubt on Iraqi-Soviet and Arab-Soviet friendship serves only the interests of the imperialists and their supporters. The Soviet-Iraqi treaty of friendship concluded in 1972 is the possession of the Iraqi and Soviet peoples. It is indestructible and immortal. The Iraqi progressive forces will preserve it as one of the important achievements of our people.

RACHKOV DENIES PLANS TO SEIZE MIDDLE EAST OILFIELDS

LD012013 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 1 Feb 80 LD

[Boris Rachkov Commentary]

[Excerpts] In the circumstances of the cold war which is being waged by the American ruling circles absurd anti-Soviet lies and fabrications are being increasingly spread. One of these hackneyed myths alleges that the Soviet Union intends to impose its control over the oilfields in the Middle East to satisfy the Soviet Union's appetite for energy.

This fabrication, which was concocted by the CIA some years ago, is now being voiced by those hostile to the Soviet Union in Washington, Beijing, Cairo and Tel Aviv. Here is what our commentator Boris Rachkov writes in this connection: Beside the fact that Soviet foreign policy completely rejects expansion, our country possesses enough sources of fuel and energy. While the capitalist world has been gripped for the seventh year by an energy crisis, the fuel and energy sectors of the Soviet economy show a remarkably consistent rate of growth. Suffice it to cite the fact that total energy production in the Soviet Union in the period 1973-79 increased by one-third.

In contrast to the United States, the Soviet Union does not covet others' natural resources. In his statement to PRAVDA Brezhnev refuted imperialist and Chinese propaganda which unashamedly charges the Soviet Union with planning expansion in the Middle East, saying that the imperialists' policy and nature are something alien to us. We do not seek others' territory and resources. The imperialists are attracted by the smell of oil.

SAKHAROV ABUSED STATE'S PATIENCE 'TOO LONG'; SLANDER 'PUNISHABLE'

LD011615 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 30 Jan 80 p 9 LD

[Borisov article under the rubric "Who's Who": "Slanderer and Hypocrites"]

[Text] "A U.S. State Department spokesman has called the Soviet authorities' actions reprehensible. He has said that Sakharov's fate causes profound concern in the United States."

"New crackdowns are being put into effect in the USSR against all those who views and activity do not coincide with the Soviet authorities' official policy."

"The Soviet authorities have decided to take steps against the country's most eminent dissident, who had seemed to be in no danger."

"The USSR's domestic policy is becoming tough."

Assertions like these fill the broadcasts of the Voice of America, the BBC and Deutsche Welle and articles in bourgeois newspapers. Distorting the truth, those who think like Sakharov are taking up the slanderer's defense.

A man who slanders his fellow-countrymen and his motherland dooms himself to contempt. When his slander turns to incitement against his own country he deserves punishment.

For over 10 years A. Sakharov has defamed his people and carried on incitement against them, and he has not done this on his own but as a soloist in the enormous chorus of bourgeois propagandists, jeering at everything the Soviet people hold sacred. And it is perfectly logical and natural that today this chorus, left without its soloist, should sob violently, shedding floods of well-paid tears. The West has lost a source of information, or to be more precise misinformation, an experienced specialist in organizing acts of anti-Soviet provocation, the supplier of "sensational exposes."

But the over-zealous mourners are giving Sakharov away. Is it not significant that the noisiest lamentations in defense of this "fighter for human rights" are emanating from the ranks of the grimmest reaction, the ranks of those who despise human rights in general and hate the rights of Soviet man in particular? Do their cries of malice not attest that they have lost a henchman who helped them to denigrate everything Soviet, to slander our people and to incite the most reactionary and aggressive forces against them?

But you should not dissemble Messrs Hypocrites, in your hypocritical sympathy for Sakharov! You yourselves, in indulging his immoderate vanity, pushed him into the abyss of lies, slander and incitement into which he slid with your help. So Sakharov's fall is also your doing!

Surely you did not seriously believe that the Soviet state would look on indefinitely while not only its restraint but also the Soviet people's patience and the right of the state and its citizens to defense against slander and incitement were being shamelessly abused?

Yes, we were patient for a long time, for too long, hoping that the voice of civic conscience, albeit a weak voice, might finally begin to speak in that man. But nothing of the sort. The longer we waiated, the more he scoffed at us, until he thought of himself virtually as a messiah called on to lead us all into the kingdom of Western "democracy."

However, an end comes to any patience when it is endlessly abused. Sakharov abused not only the patience but also the indulgence of his fellow-countrymen and his state. The facts attest that he did not stop at the basest slander. Moreover, he openly incited our ideological and political opponents against our system, thus causing direct harm to the state and his fellow-citizens.

But any slander and incitement is punishable and the state must defend its citizens against them.

The story of Sakharov's fall is an example of ideological subversion and the manipulation of the vanity of an egoist.

The "Sakharov affair" was conceived and implemented by the West in accordance with all the rules of psychological warfare. In need of an eminent figure to lend weight to the little group of "dissidents" in the Soviet Union, the Western intelligence services initially picked the genius manque of Solzhenitsyn who was eaten up immoderate vanity. Then their eyes turned to the peevish academician, who eagerly took their bait. People abroad began zealously to praise Sakharov to the skies and, encouraging his vanity, flatteringly called him "the father of the Russian hydrogen bomb" and then simultaneously "the father of Russian democracy."

This false image was created by a powerful propaganda machine and strenuously dinned into the consciousness of millions of people.

When the "Solzenitsyn wave" began to recede the bourgeois propaagandists alaeady had to hand a new idol for whom ascent to the Nobel Prize throne was immediately organized. The award of the Nobel Peace Prize to Sakharov in 1975 was such impudent mockery of the very concept of the "struggle for peace" that it gave rise to a wave of resentment and protests among broad circles of the international democratic public.

By this time Sakharov had already managed to expose himself by his own inflammatory statements and speeches against detente, against the national liberation movement, against the working class and in defense of the imperialist policy of exploitation and oppression.

On 16 September 1975 the Danish newspaper AKTUELT exposed Sakharov's so-called "humanism": "Sakharov talks a lot about humanism but it looks like sneering when he speaks of the 'tragedy of the peoples of Vietnam and Cambodia,' meaning their liberation from U.S. military occupation...."

Sakharov did not conceal his hostile attitude toward socialism in general and the Soviet system in particular. For over 10 years there has not been a single important event in the sphere of the Soviet state's foreign and domestic policy--be it preparation for and the holding of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Soviet initiatives to limit the arms race and strengthen international security and detente, or the resolutions on increasing wages and pensions and other measures to improve the Soviet people's living standard--when Sakharov has not assembled Western journalists and given these measures his own false and malign interpretation and supplied imperialist propaganda with anti-Soviet fabrications. These lies were disseminated worldwide.

Imperialist propaganda made Sakharov's name not out of love for him but out of hatred for socialism. Using this attention, which flattered his insatiable vanity, Sakharov not only slandered Soviet society but also pretended to express the opinion of many people. [paragraph continuing]

Thus Sakharov anonymously slandered other Soviet people, creating abroad a distorted picture of the mood and moral and political atmosphere in our country and openly inciting the U.S. "hawks" to interfere in our internal affairs and to suppress freedom and social progress in other countries.

Sakharov's political sympathies and statements put him on a par with the darkest reactionaries and enemies of detente.

For instance, he responded to the victory of the revolution in Portugal as he did to the victory of the Vietnamese people: "This is a retreat in the face of communism." Pinochet's accession to power, he said, is the start "of an era of consolidation and rebirth" in Chile.

And what is the worth of his statement in defense of the Nazi Hess! In his lampoon "On the Country and the World" [O Strane i Mire] Sakharov said: "The fate of the unfortunate Hess cannot fail to shock us. I write of Hess knowing of his part in creating the criminal system of Nazism...."

In the past few years Sakharov has mounted an active struggle against detente and the Soviet Government's peace-loving efforts. Not content with regular press conferences for Western journalists and meetings with representatives of the U.S. Embassy and U.S. correspondents whom he supplied with slanderous fabrications, Sakharov sent his own "evidence" to anti-Soviet assemblages abroad. In Copenhagen in 1975, in Rome in 1977 and in Washington in 1979 so-called "Sakharov hearings" were held at which his "messages," in which he distorted the USSR's peace-loving foreign policy and fueled militarist sentiments in the West, were read out. Here he maliciously slandered his own country, accusing it of "covert militarization," "totalitarianism," and "communist expansionism."

The renegade surpassed himself in blasphemy when he began to demand from the United States that it build up its arms to talk with the Soviet Union "in the language of strength." Essentially Sakharov merged with the most shameless "hawks" in the United States, supporting their false myth of the "Soviet threat" and demanding that they halt detente, renounce SALT and continue the arms race.

What is this but overt incitement against his own people? And why should such a man have certain rights to extraterritoriality in his own country against which he is calling for battle to be joined, and among his compatriots against whom he is calling for enemy fire to be aimed?

By openly going over to the camp of the enemies of detente and the inciters of war Sakharov has condemned himself to exile from our capital. And the point here is not the right to dissent, which he has abused for over 10 years, but the infliction of direct moral and political damage on his fellow-citizens.

Those who are coming to Sakharov's defense today are ignoring the rights of Soviet people who have long demanded the halting of the slanderer's anti-Soviet insinuations and his inflammatory appeals and direct participation in fueling military hysteria and thus in the propaganda of war, and war moreover against his own people.

Slander is punishable. And every Soviet person has the right to defense against his enemies, against slanderers and inciters, a right which is guaranteed by the state.

PRAVDA REPORT ON DOLGIKH 28 JANUARY LIPETSK ELECTION SPEECH

LD011651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jan 80 p 2 LD

[TASS report under the headline "Working People's Election Meetings": "Shock, Communist Labor: Voters' Meeting With V.I. Dolgikh"]

[Text] The dynamic and balanced development of social production and the consistent implementation of the party's course of improving efficiency and quality at all levels of the national economy are an important task for the final year of the 5-year plan. The working people of Lipetskaya Oblast make a weighty contribution to resolving that task. A meeting of voters from Novolipetskiy Electoral Okrug with Vladimir Ivanovich Dolgikh, candidate for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was held on 28 January.

The meeting was opened by V.N. Markov, first secretary of Lipetsk Gorkom.

The meeting participants enthusiastically elected a presidium of honor consisting of the CPSU Central Committee headed by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev.

V.I. Dolgikh's career was described by the candidate's agent, N.G. Zagorskiy, director of the Lipetsk tractor plant. He called on the voters to vote for the candidates of the indestructible bloc of Communists and nonparty people on election day, 24 February.

The meeting was addressed by A.I. Teplenichev, secretary of the Novolipetskiy metallurgical plant party committee; honored RSFSR schoolteacher T.P. Alekseyeva, director of school No 35; N.T. Fetisov, roofing workers' team leader of the Lipetskstroy Trust; and N.V. Chanysheva, first secretary of Levoberezhniy CPSU Raykom. They spoke of the oblast working people's warm approval of the party and the Soviet state's domestic and foreign policy. It was noted that labor collectives are very eager to work in shock fashion and communist style and to successfully fulfill the targets for 1980 and the 5-year plan as a whole. Tractor construction workers and metallurgists, chemical and power industry workers, and construction workers all declared their determination to greet worthily the 110th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth.

A speech was then delivered by V.I. Dolgikh, who was greeted warmly by those present. After thanking the working people of enterprises and organizations in Novolipetskiy Electoral Okrug, who nominated him as a candidate for the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, he said that he attributes this lofty trust entirely to the Communist Party, its Leninist Central Committee and the political course which the party has elaborated and is consistently implementing.

The forthcoming elections to the union republics' highest organs of state power and to local soviets are an event of great sociopolitical significance, the speaker noted. They are taking place in the final year of the 5-year plan, when all the Soviet people are stepping up their efforts in the struggle for the successful fulfillment of the 25th party congress decisions and are preparing a worthy greeting for the 110th anniversary of V.I. Lenin's birth.

The preparations for the elections are a clear manifestation of Soviet society's monolithic unity and of nationwide support for the Leninist party's domestic and foreign policy.

This has been fully revealed in the remarkable enthusiasm and unanimity with which labor collectives throughout the country, including Lipetskaya Oblast, have named Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, that glorious son of the Soviet people and outstanding leader of our party and state, as their first candidate, V.I. Dolgikh said. I have pleasure in fulfilling Leonid Ilich's instructions by conveying to the working people of Lipetsk and Lipetskaya Oblast his cordial gratitude and thanks for that trust and his wishes for great success in work for the motherland's sake and for good health and happiness in life for everyone.

This message was greeted by tumultuous prolonged applause.

The noteworthy achievements in our country's life are inextricably linked with L.I. Brezhnev's name and indefatigable activity. A loyal continuator of Lenin's great cause, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev directs all his ebullient energy, tremendous organizational talent, wisdom and perspicacity as a major politician of our time toward insuring peace and the people's security, the relaxation of tension and the strengthening of world socialism's positions.

In preparing for the next, 26th congress, the party is rallying its ranks even more closely and strengthening its links with the masses. Its policy is entirely based on the urgent requirements of social development and the vital interests of all our country's working people. That is why Soviet people's cohesion around the CPSU is so firm and indestructible and their activeness and interest in state and public affairs are so great.

The party's political platform at the forthcoming elections consists of the historic 25th CPSU Congress decisions, the further buildup of our motherland's economic potential, the strengthening of its defense capability, the safeguarding of lasting peace and international security, the development of socialist democracy and the improvement of Soviet people's prosperity and culture.

The candidate then dwelt on questions of the implementation of the CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum decisions and the provisions and conclusions contained in Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's speech at the plenum, and described the work done in the period between RSFSR Supreme Soviet elections.

These have been years of creative, constructive work by the Soviet people. The overall result of this impressive work is substantial progress in all sectors of communist building.

The dynamism and scale of economic development are clearly reflected in the absolute increases in output of the most important types of product. Construction work is taking place on a vast scale in the country. About 1,000 major industrial enterprises have been constructed. Fixed production capital in the national economy is now worth more than R1 trillion. A comprehensive program of developing agriculture and strengthening its material and technical base is being consistently implemented.

The party is steadily implementing a course of improving Soviet people's material well-being and culture. Real per capita income has increased more than 13 percent since the start of the 5-year plan.

Improving housing conditions for the working people is a subject of special party and state concern. The 5-year plan targets for housing construction are being overfulfilled. In the first 4 years apartment blocks with a total area of 423 million square meters have been commissioned.

Every union and autonomous republic, every kray, oblast and city has made its contribution to this work, the speaker noted. Take, for instance, the development of the national economy in Lipetsk and the oblast. Output has increased by nearly one-fifth over the 4 years and R58 millions' worth of different products have been sold above plan.

Speaking of topical problems in economic development, V.I. Dolgikh noted that our country has a powerful fuel and energy complex at its disposal. In the last 15 years the total extraction of all types of fuel has more than doubled. This development of the fuel base is one of the party and people's major achievements.

However, this does not make any less urgent the problems of a stable energy supply for the national economy or the question of the careful, economical expenditure of fuel and energy. The country's requirements for fuel and energy resources are increasing rapidly and, with the relocation of the fuel extracting industry and eastern and northern regions, extraction and transportation of fuel are becoming increasingly costly. That is why it is a task of great state importance to insure strict implementation of an energy-saving policy at all levels of production and municipal services. This means, above all, strengthening discipline in fuel and energy consumption, actively introducing less power-intensive technology and more economical equipment, and utilizing secondary heat resources.

A vital problem in economic development is to provide for the national economy's growing metal requirements. More pig iron, steel and rolled metal is produced in our country than in any other state in the world. But the country's real metal requirements are constantly increasing.

Tasks of increasing the operating efficiency of the entire metallurgical complex, improving its structure, and radically improving the quality and expanding the range of metal products are now moving into the foreground. An important role in resolving these tasks belongs to the Novolipetskiy metallurgical plant. The enterprise collective, in close collaboration with scientific research institutes and the Uralmash Association, has accumulated valuable experience in the rapid assimilation of powerful new converters and continuous steel smelters and is constantly improving product quality. The plant, which is equipped with modern machinery, must take up leading positions on questions of increasing output and accelerating technical progress.

The resolution of the metal problem is inconceivable without stepping up work on saving metal and insuring more rational utilization in the consumption sphere. There are considerable reserves here.

The careful, rational utilization of material and raw material resources is a major component of social production efficiency. Raw materials now have to be obtained in more difficult mining and geological conditions. That is why the country's requirements for raw materials, fuel and materials must be supplied on the basis of reducing proportional consumption norms.

To improve work efficiency and quality, labor collectives' efforts must be focussed on radically improving fixed production capital use. The renewal of this capital is taking place at an accelerated rate in the national economy.

A necessary condition of further increasing the country's economic might is the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the combination of its achievements with the advantages of the socialist system of economic management.

The introduction of new machinery is increasing in scale. And it is now particularly necessary to approach these questions in a businesslike way and to strive persistently to insure that equipping industry with modern equipment and technology and automated control systems produces savings in the national economy without fail and leads to a reduction in proportional expenditure on producing output and an improvement in output quality.

The Lipetsk tractor plant is resolving important tasks in the further mechanization of agriculture. The enterprise collective must set about further improving the output produced even more energetically.

One important question in the party's economic policy is that of increasing capital investment efficiency and improving construction work. The main emphasis must be on concentrating manpower and resources on the most important projects nearing completion. It is essential to be persistent in trying to overcome lags which develop in fufilling targets for commissioning fixed capital. This indicator must be the most important in reality as well as in words in assessing construction organizations' work.

The active participation of local party, soviet and economic organs is required in resolving the question of improving the work of railroad transport. Freight shipment requirements are increasing rapidly, but the railroads are not providing for them fully. The CPSU Central Committee and the government have outlined and are implementing a set of measures to develop railroad and other types of transport. All reserves must be brought into operation to bring about a sharp improvement in rolling stock utilization.

The successful resolution of national economic tasks depends largely on improving management and planning, structure and proportions in the economy and sectorial and territorial ties. Important measures in this direction are envisaged by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions on improving the economic mechanism.

It is necessary to strengthen autonomous financing and strive for the best end-results. This work is inextricably linked with improving discipline at all levels and in all sectors of economic building and stepping up cadres' responsibility and control over the execution of adopted decisions and plan targets. This is the aim of the recently adopted CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU resolution "On Further Strengthening Labor Discipline and Reducing Cadre Turnover in the National Economy."

V.I. Dolgikh dwelt on the Communist Party's role in the struggle to strengthen peace, end the arms race and develop friendship and cooperation between states and peoples. Soviet people, the peoples of fraternal countries and all progressive mankind warmly approve and support the Leninist foreign policy, are deeply aware of their historical responsibility for the destiny of peace and will continue to strengthen the cohesion of anti-imperialist forces and struggle persistently to normalize the international atmosphere.

The candidate again thanked those present for the trust placed in him and assured them that he will devote all his strength to the cause of communist building.

V.I. Dolgikh visited shops at the Novolipetskiy metallurgical plant and went to the tractor plant. He familiarized himself with new residential areas and social and cultural projects in the city.

In talks with leaders, specialists and workers questions of improving production efficiency and work quality in the light of the CPSU Central Committee November (1979) Plenum decisions were touched on. Special attention was devoted to the rational utilization of fixed production capital and manpower, saving raw materials and supplies, and the voters' working and living conditions.

PAPER REVIEWS BOOK ON NATIONALITIES QUESTION IN UZBEKISTAN

LD311455 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA 15 Jan 80 p 2 LD

[Book review "Tackling the Nationalities Question" by K. Karakayev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Dr of Historical Sciences A. Sapelkin]

[Text] The imposing tasks of communist building in our country demand an in-depth study of the natural laws and paths of development of the Soviet nations and ethnic groups. These problems attract researchers' close attention. The book by Z. Kh. Arifkhanova and V.T. Chebotareva entitled "Tackling the Nationalities Question in Uzbekistan" [Resheniye Natsionalnogo Voprosa v Uzbekistane], published by the Fan Publishing House, will take its place in the ranks of interesting publications.

The main stages in the history of the nationalities policy in Uzbekistan in the period of socialist building and the creation of a material and technical base for communism, are illuminated by specific historical material in this monograph.

The authors begin their essay with an analysis of the fundamental initial theoretical positions of K. Marx and F. Engels regarding the nationalities question and devote much attention to the Leninist theory of the multinational socialist state.

The book deals with the main stages in the history of the nationalities policy pursued by the Communist Party in Uzbekistan in the period of building socialism and of creating the material and technical base of communistm. A wide range of questions of the socioeconomic, political and cultural life of the republic is presented in the book with the aim of revealing the process of internationalization of social life and social integration in the Uzbek SSR, taking into account the republic's contribution to the all-union division of labor. After making a complex analysis of economic indicators and political and spiritual factors, the authors investigate in depth the national and internationalist processes, the mutual enrichment and rapprochement of the socialist nations in Soviet Uzbekistan and the forms and paths of this rapprochement. [paragraph continues]

A concrete, historical approach characterizes the essay. Analyzing party policy in the course of national-state building, the authors rightly emphasize that the formation of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic (in 1924) and its becoming part of the USSR promoted the consolidation of friendly and genuinely fraternal relations of the Uzbek and Karakalpak peoples with all peoples of the country. Tasks of socialist building were successfully solved under the conditions of national-state delimitation--a decision adopted in September 1924 by an extraordinary session of the Turkestan Central Executive Committee. All this strengthened the mutual trust of nationalities in each other and gave impetus to the process of socialist building. The book analyzes the main avenues of the evening out of the levels of economic development in Uzbekistan, encompassing the basic indicators of the economic structure of the republic's national economy--the development of industry and agriculture, the use of labor resources and the enhancement of labor productivity; the enormous successes achieved in the field of the economy and of Uzbekistan's sociopolitical life are shown. Substantial space is devoted in the book to questions of ideology and of the republic's cultural development. It is stressed that the culture of the Uzbek and Karakalpak peoples has developed on the basis of assimilation and critical reshaping of spiritual values of the past and of making use of the best democratic traditions of national literature and of the experience and traditions of Russian and world culture. These days the mutual enrichment of cultures is taking place on the objective basis of historical development under the influence of political, socio-economic and cultural factors of the new historical community of people--the Soviet people. Contemporary Uzbek and Karakalpak culture is examined by the authors in aggregate as both national and international. The best aspects of national traditions become the property of other peoples and this can be traced through the whole spectrum of national culture and art (theater, opera, ballet, cinema and so forth). For all that, the decisive factor was and still remains the undivided affirmation of the ideology of Marxism-Leninism and of proletarian internationalism, which has now become, as Comrade L.I. Brezhnev noted, "the norm of behavior for millions and millions of Soviet people of all the nations and ethnic groups." Under conditions of the scientific and technical revolution the development of nations along the path of progress, the authors stress, can be guaranteed only by a corresponding rise in the standard of people's education, and of the spiritual development of the individual. The implementation of the Lenin's nationalities policy has led to a rapid economic and cultural upsurge of the peoples, especially of the former backward regions of Tsarist Russia, which is convincingly borne out by the facts and events from the history of Uzbekistan cited in the book.

KIEV AUTHORITIES ANNOUNCE DEATH OF PETR POGREBNYAK

AU011834 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 1 Feb 80 AU

[Text] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers announce in deep sorrow that Petr Leontiyevich Pogrebnyak, loyal son of the Communist Party, prominent party and state figure of the Ukrainian SSR, CPSU Central Committee member, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member, USSR Supreme Soviet deputy, Ukrainian Supreme Soviet deputy and Ukrainian Council of Ministers first deputy chairman, died on 1 February 1980 after a grave illness.

[Signed] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Ukrainian Council of Ministers.

Funeral Ceremonies

AU041045 Kiev Domestic Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 2 Feb 80 AU

[Summary] On 2 February the inhabitants of Kiev paid their last respects to Petr Leontiyevich Pogrebnyak, CPSU Central Committee member, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member, deputy to the USSR and the Ukrainian Supreme Soviets and Ukrainian Council of Ministers first deputy chairman. The coffin with the body was placed in state in the Hall of the Club of the Administration of Affairs of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers. In tribute to the memory of the deceased, workers, peasants, scientists, cultural workers, party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol officials, Soviet soldiers and pupils filed past the coffin. "The number of those paying their last respects to Petr Leontiyevich included representatives of the working people of Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast where he fruitfully worked for many years."

"Comrades Shcherbitskiy, Borisenko, Botvin, Vatchenko, Vashchenko, Lyashko, Sokolov, Sologub, Titarenko, Fedorchuk, Gerasimov, Kapto, Pogrebnyak, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo members and candidate members," and other prominent party and government leaders mounted the guard of honor. Thousands of city inhabitants lined the streets on the way to the Baykove Cemetery. A commemorative meeting was held at the cemetery with Shcherbitskiy and other leaders on the tribune. Speeches were delivered by Titarenko, Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo member and secretary; Boyko, Dnepropetrovskiy Oblispolkom chairman; Khorunzhiy, Ukrainian minister of agriculture; and Kovalenko, Krivorozhskiy Raykom secretary. Soviet soldiers marched past the grave in tribute to the deceased.

KOSYGIN, OTHER LEADERS SIGN RETIRED MINISTER'S OBITUARY

LD011657 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 6 LD

[Obituary of Tikhon Borisovich Mitrokhin]

[Excerpts] On 18 January 1980 Tikhon Borisovich Mitrokhin, CPSU member since 1925, prominent economic leader, former minister of the USSR rubber industry and union-level personal pensioner, died in his 78th year after a long and serious illness.

[Signed] A.P. Kirilenko, A.N. Kosygin, D.F. Ustinov, P.N. Demichev, V.Y. Kostov, M.S. Smirtyukov, V.S. Fedorov, L.A. Kostandov, A.A. Yezhevskiy, N.I. Maslennikov, V.S. Smirnov, B.S. Semenov, A.I. Sevtsov, K.I. Morozov, N.P. Svetsov, T.P. Arkhipova, S.M. Tikhomirov, M.P. Parfenov, I.I. Korobkov, P.F. Bakenkov.